

ELIZABETHAN PIRATED DRAMAS

with special reference to the

'Bad' Quartos of Hamlet, Henry V, Romeo & Juliet:

with an Appendix on the

Problem of The Taming of A Shrew.

A THESIS

Submitted for the Degree of Ph.D. to the  
Faculty of Arts in the University of Edin-  
burgh

by

GEORGE IAN DUTHIE, M.A.

May, 1939.



## CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION	1
<u>THE FIRST QUARTO OF HAMLET.</u>	
Introduction: The Main Controversy	58
Section I: The Composite Nature of the 'Copy'	65
I. Q1 Scene 14	66
II. Q1 Scene 2	87
III. Q1 Scene 6	90
IV. The Play-scene	99
V. The Grave-yard Scene	106
VI. Q1 Scene 11	108
Section II: The Memorial Element in the Transmission of Passages not Interpolated	112
I. The King's Soliloquy in the Prayer- scene	112
II. Q1 Scene 6 lines 1-18 & Scene 8	129
III. Q1 Scene 14	147
IV. Q1 Scenes 3 & 4	150
V. Q1 Scene 11	155
The Marcellus Theory	159
Section III: Are there Traces of an Early <u>Hamlet</u> in Q1?	164
I. The Kyd Quotations in Q1	164
II. The Story of Hamlet's Voyage	170
III. The Character of the Queen	177
IV. The Position of the Nunnery-scene	187
V. The Name "Corambis"	197
VI. Hamlet's Age	206
Summing-up	210
<u>THE QUARTO OF HENRY V.</u>	
Chapter I: Act I	212
Chapter II: The Stately Scenes in Act II	241
Chapter III: The London Humours Scenes in Act II	259
Chapter IV: Act III	276
Chapter V: Miscellaneous	303
Conclusions	314
Bibliography	315



## THE FIRST QUARTO OF ROMEO AND JULIET.

Introduction	316
I. Does Q1 Represent a First Sketch?	316
II. The Bibliographical Links Between Q1 & Q2	336
III. Additional Note on the 'Copy' for Q2	361
Notes on the Q1 Text	367
Act I	367
Act II	383
Act III	416
Act IV	436
Act V	450
Bibliography	463

## THE PROBLEM OF THE TAMING OF A SHREW.

The Problem	465
The Borrowings from Marlowe	467
Marlowe's Hand in <u>A Shrew</u> ?	473
Kyd's Hand in <u>A Shrew</u> ?	478
Greene's Hand in <u>A Shrew</u> ?	481
Shakespeare's Hand in <u>A Shrew</u> ?	483
(a) A First Sketch?	483
(b) Shakespeare as Joint Author?	486
The Parallel Passages in <u>A Shrew</u> and <u>The Shrew</u>	490
Hickson's Parallels	527
A Ferando Soliloquy: Corroboration of Hickson?	534
The First Interview between Ferando and Kate	539
<u>Supposes, The Shrew, and A Shrew</u>	543
A Lost <u>Shrew</u> Play?	551
An Objection to the 'Bad' Quarto Theory	557
The Relationship between the two Sub-plots	560
The Verbal Parallel in the Sub-plot	566
<u>A Shrew: A Composite Structure?</u>	568
The Circumstances of the Memorial Reconstruction	570
Samuel Rowley's Hand in <u>A Shrew</u> ?	574
Bibliography	584

## INTRODUCTION.

that all the other editions were stolen and surreptitious, and affirm theirs to be purged from the errors of the former". Deplorable as he considered the Quarto texts, he found the Folio worse. "It appears," he wrote, "that this edition, as well as the quartos, was printed (at least partly) from no better copies than the prompter's book, or piece-meal parts written out for the use of the actors."<sup>1</sup>

A similarly derogatory view of all the early Shakespearian Quartos was taken by Theobald, who in the Preface to his edition<sup>2</sup> points out that in Shakespeare's time an author sold his plays to actors who thereupon became the sole proprietors of these plays, which they kept unpublished in their own interests. "Hence many pieces were taken down in short-hand," Theobald continues,<sup>3</sup> "and imperfectly copied by ear from a representation; others were printed from piecemeal parts surreptitiously obtained from the theatres, uncorrect, and without the poet's knowledge. To some of these causes we owe the train of blemishes that deform those pieces which stole singly into the world in our author's life-time."

Similarly, in his Proposals for Printing the Dramatick Works of William Shakespeare (1756),<sup>4</sup> Johnson stated the same view of

- 
1. Boswell's ed. of Malone's Shakespeare, Vol. I, p. 13.
  2. 1st edition 1733, 2nd edition 1740.
  3. See Boswell's ed. of Malone's Shakespeare, Vol. I, pp. 32-3.
  4. I quote from the reprint of the Proposals given by Walter Raleigh in his Johnson on Shakespeare (Oxford Miscellany, 1908), p. 2.

all the Shakespeare Quartos, which he regarded as having been "printed... without the concurrence of the author, without the consent of the proprietor, from compilations made by chance or by stealth out of the separate parts written for the theatre: and thus thrust into the world surreptitiously and hastily, they suffered another depravation from the ignorance and negligence of the printers".

Capell was much more enlightened. In the introduction to his edition (1768)<sup>1</sup> he actually divided the Quartos published during Shakespeare's lifetime into two distinct groups. One of these groups contained the following Quartos: Henry V (1600), The Troublesome Raigne of Iohn King of England (1591), The Merry Wives of Windsor (1602), and The Taming of A Shrew (1594): the four texts he refers to as being "no other than either first draughts, or mutilated and perhaps surreptitious impressions of those plays, but whether of the two is not easy to determine". He is quite sure that The Troublesome Raigne is a first draft; and he also classifies The First part of the Contention (1594) and The true Tragedie of Richard Duke of Yorke (1595) as first drafts. To these six plays he adds the first Quarto of Romeo and Juliet (1597). Thus we have a group of eight<sup>2</sup> Quartos, regarded as either first drafts or spurious impressions. The

---

1. See Boswell's ed. of Malone's Shakespeare, Vol. I, pp.121 seq.

2. Seven plays, but eight Quartos, since The Troublesome Raigne was published in 1591 in two parts, each occupying a quarto volume.

other Shakespearian Quartos are placed in a distinct group;<sup>1</sup> these Capell believes to depend on "the poet's own copies, however they were come by".<sup>2</sup> Capell too seems to have considered it possible that Heminge and Condell meant to assail as "stolne and surreptitious copies" all the Quartos issued up to 1623; so he admits of the fourteen texts which he groups together that "it may be true that they were 'stoln'; but stoln from the author's copies, by transcribers who found means to get at them".<sup>3</sup>

Malone's hypothesis is similar to that of Capell. In his preface of 1790 he declared<sup>4</sup> that Heminge and Condell represented all the Shakespeare Quartos before 1623 as mutilated and imperfect: "but this was merely thrown out to give an additional value to their own edition, and is not strictly true of any but two of the whole number; The Merry Wives of Windsor, and King Henry V.<sup>5</sup> With respect to the other thirteen copies, though undoubtedly they were all surreptitious, that is, stolen from the playhouse, and

1. Thirteen Quartos published during Shakespeare's lifetime, and Othello (1622).
2. Boswell's ed. of Malone's Shakespeare, Vol. I, p. 127.
3.               ibid, p. 127.
4.               ibid, p. 203.
5. Later Malone refers to the 1st Quarto of Romeo and Juliet as an "imperfect sketch" which however "furnishes many valuable corrections of the more perfect copy of that tragedy in its present state, printed in 1599" (ibid, p. 207 note).



printed without the consent of the author or the proprietors, they in general are preferable to the exhibition of the same plays in the folio; for this plain reason, because.....the editors of the folio.....printed the greater part of them from the very copies which they represented as maimed and imperfect, and frequently from a late, instead of the earliest edition".

The work of Professor Pollard has finally done away with the idea that Heminge and Condell were attacking all the Quartos as piracies. They were condemning a certain number of Quartos which are undoubtedly spurious<sup>1</sup> - the 1st Quarto of Romeo, the Quartos of Henry V and The Merry Wives, and the 1st Quarto of Hamlet. These are to be segregated as "bad Quartos". Professor Pollard then proceeds to show that in the case of any of the other Quartos, labelled "good Quartos", there is a high probability that it was printed from the authentic prompt-book, and further that there is a high probability that what was used as the prompt-book was in fact the author's own manuscript.

- 
1. Tycho Mommsen seems to have understood the true implications of Heminge and Condell's preface. In the Prolegomena to his parallel text edition of Qq. 1 & 2 of Romeo and Juliet (1859) he mentions the evidence provided by Heywood for the practice of pirating plays by stenography. He then proceeds (p. 158): "Auf eben dieselben (i.e. shorthand reports), aber nicht auf die rechtmässigen und vollständigen Quartausgaben der Shakespeare'schen Stücke bezieht sich das was Heminge und Condell in ihrer Vorrede von 'zusammenges-tohlenen und erschlichenen Ausgaben, verstümmelt und verunstaltet durch die Prellerei betrügerischer Nachdrucker' sagen." He does not here specify which are the bad and which the good Quartos. It appears from p. 159 that he regards at any rate Q1 Romeo and Juliet, Q1 Hamlet, and the Qq of the 1st Contention and True Tragedie as spurious texts.



## II. GOOD QUARTOS.

Professor Pollard has given Shakespearian scholarship a new sense of direction, infusing into it a new spirit of optimism. Previously, the "depravities" of the Quartos had seemed a matter for lamentation; Professor Pollard appeared, and showed that the numberless errors and misprints in the "good Quartos" are themselves valuable bibliographical clues which may lead us straight to Shakespeare's autograph.

Hand in hand with Professor Pollard's work in this connection goes Sir Edward Maunde Thompson's<sup>1</sup> investigation of the three pages of the manuscript of Sir Thomas More written by Hand D, and his claim that this is the hand of Shakespeare himself. At the least, it is virtually certain that Shakespeare wrote a similar hand. This has been conclusively corroborated by Professor J. Dover Wilson's<sup>2</sup> analysis of the misprints and peculiar spellings in the Shakespearian "good" Quartos. He discovered numerous mis-prints which are clearly explicable as arising from the mis-reading of the handwriting resembling that of the said three pages;<sup>3</sup>

1. See Shakespeare's Handwriting (1916), and Shakespeare's Hand in 'Sir Thomas More' (1923) pp. 57-112.

2. Shakespeare's Hand in 'Sir Thomas More', pp. 113-41.

3. Professor Pollard does not contend that all the 'good' Qq. were necessarily printed from Shakespeare's autographs, but only that in any given case there is a reasonable a priori assumption that this was so. But even if a 'good' Q was printed from a transcript of the original, the autograph still/

and he likewise finds certain abnormal spellings common to Shakespearian "good" Quartos and the three pages.

The vitally important point is, then, that we may regard it as exceedingly probable that behind any given "good" Quarto there lies a Shakespearian manuscript; and the only important amendment which has been proposed for Professor Pollard's thesis leaves this conclusion intact. Dr R. B. McKerrow<sup>1</sup> argues against the view that the printers of the "good" Quartos had prompt-copy before them. He compares the standard of the printing of these texts with that of contemporary non-dramatic texts, and shows that the latter present conditions incomparably better than the former. The frequency of error in the "good" Quartos is therefore to be attributed to difficult 'copy' rather than to compositorial incompetence. Dr McKerrow reminds us that prompt-copy must necessarily have been clearly legible, since repertory companies would need a good deal of prompting. And he makes another point, of great importance. Professor Pollard had taken short imperative stage-directions and the occurrence of actors' names instead of those of the relevant characters to indicate the use of prompt-copy by the compositor of the text concerned.<sup>2</sup> But it

---

still underlies the Q, two stages removed instead of one. And as Professor Dover Wilson points out (op. cit. p. 113) "it is exceedingly unlikely that a copyist would obliterate all traces of Shakespeare's penmanship in making his transcript". The position is not essentially different.

1. The Library, 4th series, Vol. XII (1931-2), pp. 253-75: "The Elizabethan Printer and Dramatic Manuscripts".

2. See Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates, pp. 64-6.

must be remembered that Shakespeare was writing with a particular company of actors in mind; he was a practical man of the theatre, and he wrote with performances in view. He might himself, therefore, have been responsible for the type of stage-direction in question.

One of Dr McKerrow's most important points is that where actors' names appear in a text printed from a prompt-book, we expect those names to occur in addition to those of the characters they played, as a gloss.<sup>1</sup> Thus, in Believe as You List we have the directions "Ent: Lentulus: Mr. Rob: with a letter" and "Ent: Demetrius -- Wm. Pattrick". In the Wild Goose Chase we find "Enter Leuerduce, alias Lugier, Mr Illiard" (III i). In the Two Noble Kinsmen (IV ii) we have "Enter Messenger. Curtis"; and in the first part of Antonio and Mellida (IV i) "Enter Andrugio, Lucio, Cole and Norwood". This type of stage-direction is a criterion of prompt-copy provenance. But the substitution of an actor's name for that of the character he plays is another matter. Since Shakespeare wrote with his own company in mind, he may quite easily have used an actor's name occasionally in his own manuscripts.

Consider one famous example. In Much Ado About Nothing Dogberry and Verges appear in four scenes, viz. III iii, III v, IV ii, and V i. In the third of these scenes, the names of Kemp and Cowley are substituted for those of Dogberry and Verges.

---

1. Library, Vol. XII, pp. 271-2.

Q and Ff. give Dogberry's first speech to "Keeper"; his speech at line 4 is assigned to "Andrew", and that at lines 14-15 to Keeper again (this time contracted). Otherwise Dogberry's speeches are assigned to Kemp; and those of Verges to Cowley. The usual explanation is that "Keeper" is a wrong expansion of a contraction of Kemp's name, and that "Andrew" was a nickname of Kemp, who had often played the part of "Merry Andrew". However this may be, it seems most probable that it was Shakespeare himself who was responsible for these assignments. The parts of Dogberry and Verges are so lifelike, says Dr McKerrow,<sup>1</sup> because Shakespeare was thinking of Kemp and Cowley in these parts. Professor H. D. Gray<sup>2</sup> builds up a very attractive hypothesis: Shakespeare first conceived the two characters as parts for Kemp and Cowley; the crucial trial-scene (IV ii) was the first of their scenes which he composed. He did not at first know what he was going to call the characters; after a momentary hesitation with the general "Keeper", and the name "Andrew" (almost immediately discarded), he contented himself with temporarily using the actors' names. Subsequently to his completing this scene, he hit upon names which pleased him. If this suggestion is sound, we find that Shakespeare did not compose a play straight on from beginning to end. He composed the third Dogberry-Verges scene before the first two. But however this

---

1. Op. cit. p. 275.

2. Modern Language Review, Vol. XXV (1930), pp. 263-4.



may be, it seems quite incredible that a prompter should, in the third Dogberry-Verges scene, carefully cancel speech-assignments to these characters and substitute the names of Kemp and Cowley! These names must indubitably have stood in the author's manuscript.

Now Professor Pollard<sup>1</sup> is perfectly aware that a dramatist might "if he were familiar with the theatre.....use the same technical language as a prompter", and that "the playwright would be almost as likely as the prompter to substitute the name of the actor for whom a part had been written for that of the part itself". But he proceeds: "....If the author's manuscript became the prompt-copy, whether any given direction was made by author or prompter is all one".

The conclusion of Dr McKerrow's contribution to this subject is, however, that it is unlikely that normally the author's manuscript became the prompt-copy; but after the prompt-copy had been prepared (on the basis of a transcription of the author's manuscript), the autograph itself remained, and was subsequently used as 'copy' for authorized editions. Thus the most important part of Professor Pollard's contention remains, viz. that the 'copy' for any given "good" Quarto was in all probability the author's own manuscript.

---

1. Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates, pp. 63-4.

### III. BAD QUARTOS.

It is theoretically possible to suppose that someone connected with a company of actors might surreptitiously copy the prompt-book of a play, and sell his transcript to a publisher.<sup>1</sup> This would be piracy; yet the published text would, if the scribe were efficient, present a sound version of the play as acted. There is thus no necessary relation between the legality or illegality of a publication and the quality of the text which it contains. It is, however, difficult to imagine such a theft as practically possible. The work of transcription would take time; and detection would be virtually certain.

In the address "To the great Variety of Readers" in the first Folio, Heminge and Condell complain of a number of "stolne and surreptitious copies" which contain mutilated and deformed texts. In other words, they complain of what we may call "reported" texts, and it is with these that we are here concerned.

We must at the outset be quite sure of what we mean by a "reported" text. Dr W. W. Greg has given the best definition of reporting.<sup>2</sup> He uses the term to denote "any process of transmission which involves the memory no matter at what stage

1. Cf. the theories of Capell and Malone supra.

2. See Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements: 'The Battle of Alcazar' and 'Orlando Furioso' (Malone Society, 1922), pp. 256-9.



or in what manner". Thus the term covers several different methods of transmission for the memorial element may be involved at one or more of several stages. For example, in the case of an edition based on a stenographic report of one or more performances of a play, no matter how faithful to the performance(s) the report is, the text is still separated from the authentic version as contained in the official prompt-copy by the memories of the actors. Similarly, when an actor dictates a play or a portion of a play to a scribe, without assistance from any written 'part', the resultant text is a reported text. And so on.

Since Professor Pollard's segregation of the first Quartos of Romeo and Juliet and Hamlet and the Quartos of Henry V and The Merry Wives of Windsor as "bad" Quartos, this class of text has received much critical attention. Two very important developments have taken place.

Firstly, it has been realised that this category is not limited to four Shakespeare Quartos: it has been enlarged by the inclusion of other dramatic texts, Shakespearian and non Shakespearian.<sup>1</sup>

- 
1. See Leo Kirschbaum, "A Census of Bad Quartos", Review of English Studies, Vol. XIV (1938), pp. 20-43. The following editions are listed as giving "bad" texts: Romeo and Juliet Q 1597, The Merry Wives of Windsor Q 1602, Henry V Q 1600 Hamlet Q 1603, Pericles Q 1609 (not in Ff. 1,2: included in F3, 2nd issue), The First Part of the Contention betwixt the two Famous Houses of York and Lancaster Q 1594 (a "bad" Q of II Henry VI), The True Tragedie of Richard Duke of Yorke Q 1595 (a "Bad" Q of III Henry VI), King Lear Q 1608 Richard III Q 1597, The "Parliament Sceane" in Q4 Richard II, 1608, i.e. IV i 154-318, Orlando Furioso (Greene) Q 1594, The Massacre/

Secondly, it has been realised that some "bad" Quartos present texts which are memorial reconstructions, made for provincial performances by actors who had previously taken part in the plays concerned, but who no longer had access to the prompt-books.<sup>1</sup> The notion, for long widespread, that pirated editions of plays were in general to be accounted for as based on the notes of stenographers sent to performances by thievish publishers has given way to the view that at least a large proportion of the extant Elizabethan and Jacobean "bad" texts are in fact memorial reconstructions. There is external evidence that stenographic piracy was a known practice, at any rate in the first part of the seventeenth century; modern scholarship differentiates, therefore, between stenographic reports and memorial reconstructions.

---

Massacre at Paris (Marlowe) octavo, undated; If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody Part I (Heywood) Q 1605, A Knack to Know an Honest Man Q 1596, The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth Q 1598, Sir Thomas Wyatt (Dekker, Chettle, Wentworth Smith, & Webster) Q 1607, The True Tragedy of Richard III Q 1594, Edward I (Peele) Q 1593, Fair Em Q circa 1593, George a Greene Q 1599, Philaster (Beaumont & Fletcher) Q1 1620 (Q2 1622 is a "good" Q). Kirschbaum states the possibility that Q1 A Maid's Tragedy is a "bad" Q. He does not regard The Taming of A Shrew (Q 1594) in this category, to which however I am convinced it belongs.

1. The realisation of the existence of this type of reported text is due to Dr W. W. Greg's analysis of Orlando Furioso in his Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements (1922).

(A) PIRACY BY STENOGRAPHY.

In 1623 Heminge and Condell condemned a group of Shakespearian Quartos as "stolne and surreptitious copies". In the same year John Webster's play The Devil's Law Case was published. It contains a reference to a particular method of pirating plays, in the following passage:

Do you hear, officers?  
 You must take great care that you let in  
 No Brachygraphy<sup>1</sup> men to take notes.

We possess other evidence of the practice of pirating plays by stenographic reporting. In 1612 Sir George Buck declared, in his Third Universitie of England, that those who know brachygraphy "can readily take a Sermon, Oration, Play, or any long speech, as they are spoke, dictated, acted and uttered in the instant".

But the best-known evidence of the practice comes from Thomas Heywood, who refers, in two separate places, to the publication of mangled versions of his work. The first of these is ambiguous. In the preface to The Rape of Lucrece (1608) he tells us that "some of my plays have (unknown to me, and without any of my direction) accidentally come into the printer's hands, and, therefore, so corrupt and mangled (copied only by the ear) that I have been as unable to know them as ashamed to challenge them". The

---

1. We need not suspect a reference to Peter Bales' system of "Brachygraphy" (first published in 1590). Webster probably employs the term in a purely generic sense.

statement that these plays were "copied...by the ear" does not necessarily imply that stenography was used. But in another well-known passage Heywood is unequivocal.

In 1637 he published a collection of "Pleasant Dialogues and Drammas", in which there was included a prologue to a "Play of Queene Elizabeth".<sup>1</sup> It is generally agreed that this play is his If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody, or The Troubles of Queen Elizabeth, Part I, first published in 1605 by Nathaniel Butter. Of this play Heywood says that

some by Stenography drew  
The plot: put it in print: (scarce one word trew)....

Dr Greg fixes 1632 as the probable date of the composition of this prologue. It was inserted in the 1639 Quarto of the play.

At first sight we have here the clearest evidence that the reporting of plays by stenography was a known practice in 1605. But Signor G. N. Giordano-Orsini<sup>2</sup> has shown, to my mind quite conclusively, that Heywood was mistaken in his view of the nature of the transmission of this text. It is undoubtedly "stolne and surreptitious"; but the theory of note-taking by a stenographer in the theatre fails to account for certain peculiarities which Signor Giordano-Orsini discusses.

He points out the inequality of the text. Often it is curt and abrupt, with numerous metrical deficiencies; on the other

1. See W. W. Greg, The Library, 4th series, Vol. XVII (1936-7) p. 173.

2. Times Literary Supplement, 1930, December 4th. The Library, 4th series, Vol. XIV (1933-4) pp. 313-38.



hand, at many points it is full and smooth, with a perfect metrical structure. The cardinal point is that four parts are consistently good, viz. those of Gage, King Philip, Dodds, and the Clown. Furthermore, when one of these characters is on the stage the quality of the speeches of the other characters is higher than when none of the four is present. Giordano-Orsini suggests that the three first-named parts could be played by a single actor, and erects the hypothesis of memorial reconstruction of the play by two actors. So his conclusion is that either Heywood was wrong, or that a stenographer's notes were supplemented by the memories, and perhaps the written 'parts', of the two actors. The theory of memorial reconstruction, however, is itself adequate to explain the condition of the text.

Professor Pollard<sup>1</sup> has pointed out that Sgr. Giordano-Orsini's discovery in no way invalidates Heywood's evidence as to the existence of the practice of note-taking in the theatre; rather the reverse. Heywood made his accusation about 1632; he knew that his play had been pirated and published in a mangled form in 1605. If stenographers were known to go to theatres to take notes of plays, nothing would be more natural than for Heywood to jump to the conclusion that his play had been reported in this fashion. That he thought this is a fairly clear indication that the practice existed and was known, in the 1630's at all

---

1. The Library, series 4, Vol. XIV, p. 352. See also Greg, The Library, series 4, Vol. XVII, p. 174.

events.

It was largely upon Heywood's testimony of the practice that the view was formed that the spurious Shakespearian quartos are stenographic piracies. It was for long the traditional hypothesis that Timothy Bright's system of "Characterie" (first published in 1588) was employed. Research upon this system of shorthand, in connection with the Shakespearian piracies, has been largely the work of German investigators. The most important studies on this subject are the following: Curt Dewischeit, "Shakespeare und die Stenographie", Shakespeare Jahrbuch, Vol. XXXIV (1898) pp. 170-220; P. Friedrich, "Studien zur englischen Stenographie im Zeitalter Shakespeare" (1914), and Archiv. für Schriftkunde, Jahrgang I, 1915 pp. 88-140, 1916 pp. 147-88; A. Schottner, Archiv für Schriftkunde, Jahrgang I, 1918 pp. 229-340; M. Förster, Shakespeare Jahrbuch, Vol. LXVIII (1932) pp. 87-102; and, in English, Hereward T. Price, The Text of Henry V (1920), Chapter III, pp. 11-19, and Essays in English and Comparative Literature (Michigan), 1933, pp. 162 seq.

As regards the 'bad' Quartos of Romeo and Juliet, Henry V, The Merry Wives of Windsor, and Hamlet, there are certain initial difficulties in the way of accepting the theory of stenographic transmission. The first applies only to the last three of these texts: there are definite inequalities in these reported versions. The parts of certain characters are consistently better reported than those of the others. This in itself might be explained on the stenographic theory by assuming that the enunciation



of certain actors on the stage was consistently slower and clearer than that of the others. But there is more to be said: the comparative excellence of the reporting extends beyond the actual speeches of such characters, embracing also the speeches of other characters while these are on the stage. This is a distinct obstacle to the theory of stenographic reporting. Price,<sup>1</sup> for example, is forced to allow that in the case of Q Henry V the activities of the stenographer were supplemented by reporting actors.

The second initial objection of which I spoke applies to all four of the texts named. They are full of transferences of words, phrases, lines from one place to another (often at considerable intervals). The frequency of such transferences is one of the most striking characteristics of these quartos. Now admittedly the Elizabethan companies were what we should call repertory companies: long runs were unknown. One of the most recent critics to insist on the theory of stenographic transmission for the first quarto of Hamlet is Dr B. A. P. Van Dam:<sup>2</sup> and he is forced to attribute all these transferences ('anticipations' and 'recollections') to the actors themselves. For a stenographer would not be expected to produce them. It appears, then, that Dr Van Dam would assume an appallingly low standard of accuracy

---

1. The Text of 'Henry V', p. 19.

2. The Text of Shakespeare's 'Hamlet' (1924), Chapter 1.

in the actors of Shakespeare's company -- one of the principal London companies. The inaccuracy for which he contends is quite incredible. But both of these objections to the theory of stenographic piracy point directly to imperfect memorial reconstruction.

Another point worthy of note is that where errors occur in reported texts apparently through mishearing, these are not necessarily to be taken as implying stenographic transmission. An actor may mishear a fellow-actor just as readily as a stenographer may. Furthermore, we cannot dismiss the distinct possibility that an actor, reporting a text from memory, may dictate to a scribe, who may at certain points mishear him.<sup>1</sup>

The theory of stenographic reporting (by Bright's system) in the case of the Shakespearian 'bad' Quartos up to and including that of Hamlet has been demolished, in my view effectively, by Mr W. Matthews.<sup>2</sup> I refer here to only one of the most important points he makes, showing that these texts do not exhibit to any noticeable extent a type of error which would be most characteristic of Bright's system of shorthand.

Dewischeit<sup>3</sup> gives a full description of the system. Bright

1. Cf. Greg, Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements, p. 354.

2. Modern Language Review, Vol. XXVII (1932) pp. 243 seq. "Shorthand and the Bad Shakespeare Quartos"; and The Library, series 4, Vol. XV (1934-5) pp. 481 seq. "Shakespeare and the Reporters".

3. op. cit. pp. 192 seq.

started with a straight vertical line, representing 'a'. By adding strokes, hooks, etc. to the top of this line he evolved 17 other symbols.

	└	└	└	└	└	└	└	└	└	└	└	└	└	└	└	└	└
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	P	R	S	T	U.

'K' and 'q' were represented by 'c': 'j' and 'y' by 'i': 'v' and 'w' by 'u'. 'X' and 'z' were dropped out. Thus the twenty-four letters of the alphabet were represented by eighteen symbols. Furthermore, various distinguishing marks could be added to the foot of each of these symbols; altogether each could appear in twelve different forms. Now each sign could be written vertically, horizontally, slanted to the right, or slanted to the left. Thus the symbol for each letter could appear in 48 variant forms. Altogether the system made available 864 symbols. Now each of the 48 signs associated with one letter represented a word beginning with that letter; these words were called "characterical words". Actually Bright did not use 48 characterical words beginning with each letter; under 'A' he gives only 24, under 'B' 40, under 'C' all 48 (since 'K' and 'Q' were also included), under 'D' 32, under 'E' 17, etc. In all Bright has 556 "characterical words".

A system of shorthand which could represent only 556 words would, of course, be useless. So Bright evolved what he called "consenting method" and "dissenting method". By "consenting method" a synonym of a given "characterical word" was indicated by the symbol for that word, with the symbol for the initial

letter of the synonym prefixed. By "dissenting method" an antonym of a given "characterical word" was indicated by the symbol for that word, with the symbol for the initial letter of the antonym suffixed. Bright gives a long list of words, indicating in each case what "characterical word" was appropriate.

The symbol for a given "characterical word" could, by "consenting method", indicate not only direct synonyms but words clearly associated with the "characterical word". Thus, for example, the symbol for the "characterical word" fruit was used to indicate different fruits. Now in many cases there are several individual fruits which begin with the same letter. If one wished to write the word "apple" by Bright's system, one would write the symbol for "fruit", and, in front of it, the symbol for 'a'. But, when the shorthand was being transcribed, all that would be apparent would be that a fruit beginning with 'a' was meant. Reference to Bright's table of "appellative words" (i.e. synonyms and associated words attached to each "characterical word") shows that among the fruits rendered by the characterical word fruit are apple, almond, acorn, apricot. Thus as far as the transcriber of the shorthand notes could know, any one of these might be intended. This is one of the great defects of "Characterie".

It follows that if this system was used in the reporting of Shakespearian 'bad' Quartos, a not uncommon type of error in these Quartos would be the occurrence of a variant beginning with the same letter as the genuine reading. This type of error does



occur: for example, in Q Henry V Price<sup>1</sup> cites I ii 155 Q hurt F harm'd; I ii 284 Q wife F widows (both rendered by the "characterical word" marry with the sign for 'w' in front); I ii 308 Q check F chide (both rendered by rebuke with 'ch' in front); IV iii 123 Q nought F none (both rendered by some with 'n' in front). But the number of such cases in the Shakespearian 'bad' Quartos is utterly insignificant when compared with the tremendous number of variant readings, often synonymous with the genuine readings, which begin with a different letter. It seems quite clear that if Bright's "Characterie" was indeed used, the practitioners concerned did not understand "consenting method". For we could only assume that in the vast majority of cases where it was necessary to indicate synonyms of "characterical words" they omitted to insert in front of the symbols the signs which would convey the initial letters of the synonyms. But it is much more reasonable to suppose that the system was not used, when we find that the characteristic error which it would encourage is not exemplified to any great extent in the Shakespearian 'bad' Quartos. This is one of Matthews' main arguments, and its cogency cannot be denied.

Apart from this altogether, there is internal evidence in the 'bad' texts of Henry V, The Merry Wives, and Hamlet that the method of transmission in these cases was memorial reconstruction

---

1. op. cit. p. 14.

effected by the actors who took certain parts. These parts are consistently better reported than others. And the quality of the reporting of the other characters is higher when these actors are on the stage. In the 1st Quarto text of Romeo and Juliet there is no part consistently better reported than the others. But here if anywhere we can say confidently that Bright's Characterie will not account for the transmission of this text. In addition to the arguments already adduced, we find that this is in many ways the best reported of the Shakespearian 'bad' texts. There is very little mislineation -- one of the faults we should most expect in a shorthand report; and there is comparatively little metrical deficiency. Bright's system was exceedingly cumbersome, and could hardly give such good results as we have here. As Matthews points out, there is a very large number of words in the 'bad' Quartos which are not assigned by Bright to any characterical word. Shakespeare's vocabulary is extraordinarily rich: and if Characterie were used in reporting him, the stenographer would find that on countless occasions he would have to pause and think what characterical word he could use. This would result in his being unable to note down what was said immediately after the word over which he paused. But the standard of the reporting of most of Q1 Romeo and Juliet is far too high to make it possible to suppose that this clumsy system was employed in its transmission.

I think that Matthews makes his point cogently and conclusively. The shorthand systems of Bright and Peter Bales (who



published a system largely plagiarised from Bright in 1590) were in all probability not used in the reporting of the Shakespearian 'bad' Quartos. The much more efficient system of John Willis (published in 1602) has not to my knowledge received examination yet.

We have already noted that the fact that Heywood was wrong in declaring that If You Know Not Me, 1605, was pirated by stenography in no way invalidates his testimony of the existence of the practice of reporting plays by this method. We may say that we know that plays were pirated in this manner. If the Shakespearian 'bad' Quartos up to 1603 were not, are there any Shakespeare texts which were?

The question of the transmission of the 1st Quarto of King Lear (1608) is one which has recently occupied a good deal of critical attention. E. K. Chambers<sup>1</sup> regards it as a piracy, and suggests that "possibly it was produced by shorthand and not memorization". Dr W. W. Greg<sup>2</sup> regards it as a stenographic report; he stresses the extraordinary frequency of mislineation in the text. Professor Quincy Adams<sup>3</sup> also believes it to be a

1. William Shakespeare, Vol. I, p. 465.
2. Neophilologus, Vol. XVIII (1933), pp. 241-62: "The Function of Bibliography in Literary Criticism Illustrated in a Study of the Text of 'King Lear'". Also The Library, series 4, Vol. XVII (1936-7), pp. 172-83: "King Lear -- Mislineation and Stenography".
3. Modern Philology, Vol. XXXI (1933-4), pp. 135 seq.: "The Quarto of King Lear and Shorthand".

shorthand report, arguing however that Bright's "Characterie" was employed. The other side in the controversy is represented by Mr Edward Hubler<sup>1</sup> and Miss Madeleine Doran,<sup>2</sup> neither of whom regards Q1 King Lear as a reported text. Mr Hubler attributes the mislineation to the compositor's efforts to save space. But Dr Greg has some pertinent objections to make.<sup>3</sup> Hubler states that approximately 500 verse-lines are set up as prose, and that this saves a great deal of space. But Greg asks why, if the compositor desired economy in this respect, he did not set up all the verse as prose, a procedure adopted in the 1678 Quarto of The Elder Brother, a verse play. He points out that approximately two-thirds of the verse is correctly divided, with no effort at compression, and further, that some sixty lines of prose are set up as verse, which actually results in waste of space. The Q1 punctuation is very erratic; this, and the mislineation, seem to Dr Greg to point to the hypothesis of stenographic reporting. "A stenographer does not produce mislining directly," he writes. "His shorthand report will contain no indication of line-division at all. And it was a longhand transcription of such a report, undivided metrically and practically unpointed, that I postulated as copy. The actual misdivision

1. Essays in Dramatic Literature. The Parrott Presentation Volume. Ed. Hardin Craig. Princeton, 1935.
2. The Text of King Lear, Stanford Univ. Publications, Lang. & Lit. Vol. IV, No. 2, 1931.
3. See Library, series 4, Vol. XVII, p. 176.

would, of course, be the work of the compositor, as Mr Hubler contends."<sup>1</sup> Considering the fact that much of the text is correctly divided, Greg suggests<sup>2</sup> that this "is just what we should expect of two or more compositors of different ability making what they could of copy that presented no metrical division at all".

Miss Doran's view is that "the first quarto was set up from a manuscript containing the first draft of the play much revised, and that the folio was set up from a <sup>ened</sup>shorthand-transcript of this revised manuscript".<sup>3</sup>

I cannot pronounce on the respective merits of these two groups of hypotheses, for I have been unable to examine the problem sufficiently closely. I can only confess to the distinct impression that the 'bad Quarto' theory is the more satisfactory. What I am concerned with is the conclusion that if Q1 King Lear is a reported text, it is not a memorial reconstruction but a stenographic report. The text is in very much better condition than the first Quartos of Romeo, Henry V, The Merry Wives, and Hamlet. It contains no such marks of memorial reconstruction as are to be found in these four reported texts. But if Q1 Lear is a stenographic piracy, it cannot have been transmitted through

---

1. See Library, series 4, Vol. XVII, p. 175.

2. ibid. p. 176.

3. Stanford Univ. Studies, Lang. & Lit. Vol. IV, p. 100.

the shorthand systems of Bright or Bales; neither of these could have yielded results nearly so good as those with which we are faced here.<sup>1</sup>

Professor Quincy Adams argues that Bright's system was used. Let us consider the criterion which we have already used. Quincy Adams cites<sup>2</sup> some examples of the substitution in Q1 of synonyms beginning with the same letter as the corresponding genuine readings found in the Folio. Among the examples he gives are these: III ii 7 Q smite F strike (both indicated in Bright's system by the symbol for the characterical word 'hit', with that for 's' prefixed); II iv 138 Q slack F scant (both indicated by the symbol for 'loose' with that for 's' prefixed). Bright suggested that when more than one synonym existed the stenographer might prefix the first two letters of the required word: still, however, errors might arise in deciphering. Adams quotes the following: II iv 187 Q struck F stock'd (both would be indicated by the symbol for the characterical word "punish" with those for 'st' prefixed); III ii 16 Q task F tax (both indicated by the symbol for 'labour' with those for 'ta' prefixed); I i 241 Q respects F regards (both indicated by the symbol for 'consider' with those for 're' prefixed); and so on. Professor Adams manages to produce quite an impressive little list; but when we

---

1. See Greg, Neophilologus, Vol. XVIII, p. 256.

2. Modern Philology, Vol. XXXI, pp. 146-8.



take account of Mr Matthews' work, already referred to, we see that in order to use these synonym-variants as proof of the use of "Characterie" we should have to show that they were much more frequent than synonym-variants beginning with a letter different from the initial of the genuine reading. This Professor Adams has not done.

But the greatest argument against the theory that "Characterie" was used to report the Q1 text of King Lear is the very cumbrous nature of that system. I agree with Dr Greg that if stenography was used here, it must have been a more efficient system than Bright's.

There is evidence that "Characterie" may have been used in reporting sermons. Price has made a close comparison of the two versions of Henry Smith's sermon entitled "A Fruitefull Sermon Vpon part of the 5. Chapter of the first Epistle of Saint Paul to the Thessalonians". The first edition, printed in 1591 for Nicholas Ling, is stated on the title-page to have been "taken by Characterie". In the same year an authorized edition was published.<sup>1</sup>

In The Text of Henry V (p. 12) Price sets out a passage of this sermon as it appears in the reported and in the authentic version. Certainly the former is very close to the latter; and Price argues that "Characterie" was an efficient system. But

---

1. Price has published a reprint of both versions, with an introduction: A Fruitfull Sermon, 1922.

again Matthews has cogent objections to this conclusion.<sup>1</sup> In the first place, he suggests that this may be an analogous case to that of another sermon of Smith, entitled "A Sermon of the Benefite of Contentation", first published in 1591, and stated on the title-page to have been "taken by characterie" (the printer was Roger Ward, the publisher John Proctor). In the same year an amended reprint was issued: on the title-page we find that the sermon was "taken by characterie, and examined after". This edition was printed by Abel Jeffes for Roger Ward. In 1591 Smith issued an authorized version, printed by Jeffes: on the title-page it is said to be "Newly examined, and corrected by the author". Of this authorized edition Matthews writes as follows:<sup>2</sup> "In the preface to this edition, Smith said that he had taken pains to 'perfit the matter and to correct the print'. This apparently means that he adopted the text of the pirated copy and merely corrected it, and this may well have been his method for A Fruitfull Sermon." We cannot be sure that in comparing the pirated edition of the latter with the authorized one, we are comparing the reported version with the original sermon which the stenographer heard. Consequently all deductions made from such a comparison as to the efficiency of "Characterie" are at least suspect. In the second place, Matthews suggests that

---

1. Modern Language Review, Vol. XXVII, pp. 248-9, 255-9.

2. ibid. p. 257.

the term "Characterie" used on the title-pages referred to does not necessarily imply Bright's system; the word may have a purely generic significance here.<sup>1</sup>

Mr David Salmon points out<sup>2</sup> that Bright himself admitted that a discourse could not be taken down by his system unless "uttered as becommeth the grauitie of such actions". And Matthews shows<sup>3</sup> that in a version of one of Egerton's sermons, produced in 1589 by one A.S., "taken as it was uttered by Characterie", the reporter claims for his reproduction, not phraseological accuracy, but the fact that "I haue not missed one word whereby either the truth of doctrine might be peruerterd or the meaning of the preacher altered". In other words, he claims to reproduce the content correctly, but he does not claim to do so in the same words as the preacher used.

A Shakespeare play was certainly not delivered on the stage with the 'grauitie' that 'becommeth' a sermon. It appears to me utterly inconceivable that Bright's "Characterie" could yield results nearly so good as those found in the first Quarto of King Lear. The difficulties presented by the system are admirably summed up by Matthews:<sup>4</sup>

...In computing the utility of Bright's system we must consider: (1) the tremendous grasp of English vocabulary required by the stenographer; (2) the degree of mental

- 
1. M.L.R. XXVII, p. 258.
  2. Times Literary Supplement, 1919, pp. 69-70: letter entitled "The 'Stolne and Surreptitious' Texts".
  3. Library, series 4, Vol. XV, p. 496.
  4. M.L.R. XXVII, p. 254.

alertness necessary to assign words to their true Charactericall words; (3) the difficulty of learning and of distinguishing between over 550 words (if particles are included) which have very similar signs; (4) the slowness of the system caused by the method of writing in columns and the necessity of moving the hand backwards to write the initial letters.

I think that there can be little doubt that Professor Quincy Adams is mistaken in supposing that Q1 Lear was reported by this method: it seems desirable that other systems (e.g. that of John Willis) should be examined by some investigator in connection with this text.

Copies of Richard II published in 1608 have two different title-pages. The later contains the words "With new additions of the Parliament Sceane, and the deposing of King Richard". Professor Pollard deals with this addition (IV i 154-318) in his King Richard II: A New Quarto, pp. 62-3. He concurs with the view expressed by W. A. Harrison,<sup>1</sup> who states that "it seems certain from the context that this passage....was not an addition to the play; but for some reason had been omitted" from the earlier editions.

Pollard considers that the text of the passage described by the publisher (Matthew Law) as an addition is too corrupt for us to be able to suppose that it was legitimately obtained from the King's Men. It was in all probability illegally obtained "by

---

1. Introduction to the Griggs facsimile of the 1608 Quarto containing the passage in question.



suborning someone employed in the theatre to make a surreptitious copy, or by persuading someone employed in the theatre, or sent to it for the purpose, to take down the lines in shorthand, or to learn them by heart and dictate them to the printers".<sup>1</sup> Pollard doubts whether even a surreptitious transcript could result in so corrupt a text, and considers it most probable that the 'copy' was "procured by means of shorthand writers specially sent...for the purpose".<sup>2</sup> It is important to notice that both the Richard II deposition scene and the 1st Quarto of King Lear appeared after the publication of John Willis' system of shorthand (1602).

(B) MEMORIAL RECONSTRUCTION.

In an article in The Athenaeum, Vol. XXIX (1857), p. 182, Tycho Mommsen wrote of the 1st Quarto of Hamlet: "I apprehend that I discern two hands employed, one after the other, upon this Hamlet, the one being probably that of an actor, who put down, from memory, a sketch of the original play, as it was acted, and who wrote very illegibly; the other that of a bad poet, most

---

1. King Richard II: A New Quarto, p. 64.

2. ibid.

probably 'a bookseller's hack', who, without any personal intercourse with the writer of the notes, availed himself of them to make up this early copy of Hamlet." Thus Mommsen regarded Q1 Hamlet as basically an actor's memorial reconstruction; but he made no suggestion as to the part or parts which the actor concerned had played.

In his Harness Prize Essay on the 1st Quarto of Hamlet (1880) W. H. Widgery compared the part of Voltemar with the versions of the 'good' texts, and noticed that in Q1 it is reproduced with a fidelity conspicuously above the general level of that text. Taking this into account he suggested that Q1 represents a version of an early Shakespearian Hamlet (written between 1596 and 1598) stolen by an actor who had played the part of Voltemar. He further suggested that the condition of the Q1 text of the Player-Duke's speeches warranted the additional supposition that the pirate-actor may also have taken this part. Whereas the text of Voltemar's long speech (corresponding to II ii 60-80 of the received text) and the single line he speaks along with Cornelius (corresponding to I ii 40) is obviously an extraordinarily faithful reproduction of the passages as found in the 'good' texts, the Q1 version of the Player-Duke's first speech (Q1 scene 9 lines 100-7) is entirely different from that of the later editions (III ii 153-8). Widgery's hypothesis implies, therefore, that, revising the hypothetical 1596-8 play, Shakespeare left Voltemar's part as it was, but substantially altered that of the Player-Duke (Player-King in the later texts).

In 1910 Dr W. W. Greg published an edition of the Quarto of The Merry Wives of Windsor ("Tudor and Stuart Library"). This contains a very important introduction, in the course of which the author expresses the opinion that "the supposition of neither shorthand nor longhand notes is necessary to account for the text as we have it. The very best passages of the quarto are easily within the reach of an even inexperienced pirate relying on memory alone" (pp. xxxvi-xxxvii). H. C. Hart had pointed out that the Host's part is reproduced very fully in the Quarto (Arden ed., intro. p. xx). Greg noticed in addition to this "the comparative excellence of the reporting of those scenes in which the Host is on the stage even where he takes no prominent part in the conversation" (op. cit. p. xxxviii). This, along with the fact that in the Host's speeches there are numerous small discrepancies too trifling to be attributed to revision, effectively puts out of court any suggestion that the Host's written 'part' was available to the compiler of the Quarto text. Dr Greg advanced the hypothesis, now widely accepted, that an actor who had played this role was responsible for the entire Quarto text, produced from memory. "That Mine Host had a main finger in the work I feel convinced", he writes: and there is no reason to suppose that he merely assisted a shorthand reporter, for there is "no justification for conjecturing two agents where one will suffice" (op. cit. p. xli). His proof that the text of this Quarto is a memorial reconstruction effected by an actor of the part of the Host is one of the two main foundation-stones of the study of 'bad' quartos

which have been securely laid by Dr Greg.

In an article entitled "The First Quarto Hamlet" in the Modern Language Review, Vol. X (1915) pp. 171-80, H. D. Gray reverted to Mommsen's suggestion that a hack-poet assisted in the preparation of that text. This hack-poet supplemented an imperfect report of the Shakespearian play as it stood in 1600-1: and the report was the work of an actor who had played the part of Marcellus in that play. Gray points to the fact that the scenes in which Marcellus appears are conspicuously well reported; but he lists numerous small errors in Marcellus' own speeches. The existence of these, and the fact that in the Marcellus-scenes the high standard of the reporting also involves speeches by other characters, militates against the supposition that Marcellus' written 'part' was used in the preparation of the 'bad' text; these conditions call for the hypothesis of memorial reconstruction by the actor concerned. Gray also notes the excellent quality of the Q1 version of the play-within-the-play, suggesting that that version is a very good report of matter which underwent some revision before the Q2 text appeared. Thus 'Marcellus' may well have taken the part of one of the Players. In a later article (P.M.L.A., Vol. XLII (1927), pp. 721-35) Gray suggests that the part he took here was that of Lucianus. The speech in Q1 which corresponds to III ii 255-60 in the received text is most noticeably accurate.

Here, then, we have hypotheses which posit memorial reconstruction by one actor. The evidence is inequality of the



standard of the reporting in a pirated text, the speeches of certain characters being consistently of a higher level than those of the others, and the general level of the text being higher where these characters are present on the stage.

As we have already seen in the case of If You Know Not Me, Part I (1605), more than one actor may have been involved in a memorial reconstruction. In a study entitled The Text of Henry V (1920) Hereward T. Price argued that the 'bad' Quarto of that play was in part a stenographic piracy; but this method of transmission was supplemented by other means. Price notices that the parts of Gower and the Governor of Harfleur are reported with extraordinary accuracy, and suggests that the speeches of these characters in the Quarto were printed from the written 'parts' of the actor or actors who took the two roles. He also finds the Quarto version of Exeter's part distinctly above the average; he says "On the whole, I am inclined to believe that Exeter's speeches were supplied by an actor, though they are marred by many faults. Exeter is not nearly so well reported as Gower" (op. cit. p. 19). Presumably, therefore, Price considers that an actor who had taken the part of Exeter reconstructed his speeches from memory. He notes the excellence of "the difficult piece of Latin and French at the end of V ii", spoken by Exeter, and suggests that at this point in the Quarto "there must have been some good manuscript before the compositor".

Price considers, then, that memorial reconstruction played some part in the transmission of the Quarto text of Henry V,

involving one actor, who had taken the part of Exeter. I am strongly of the opinion that it played a much larger part than he admits. The superlative quality of Gower's speeches in the Quarto is a most striking fact; but, in suggesting that this is due to the compilers of the text having had access to the manuscript 'part' of the actor concerned, Price leaves out of account two very important points: (1) the excellence of the reporting extends beyond Gower's own speeches, embracing the speeches of the other characters while he is on the stage; this is vividly noticeable for example, in the Quarto version of III vi, a long and difficult scene: (2) in Price's own words (op. cit. p. 11) "Gower is the best reported character in the Quarto, yet even his speeches are not linked bibliographically with the Folio". Now I find that the Governor's single speech (Q III iii 12-18) is very definitely bibliographically linked with the Folio (III iii 44-50).<sup>1</sup> An actor's written 'part' would presumably be transcribed from the prompt-book; and presumably the prompt-book (or a transcript of that, or the author's manuscript from which the prompt-book was copied) underlies the authentic (Folio) text. Speeches in the Quarto printed from an actor's 'part' (or a transcript of such a 'part') would be expected to exhibit bibliographical connections with the corresponding passages in the Folio. Yet, as Price admits, this is not the case with the speeches of Gower. The only possible hypothesis is that an actor

---

1. See p.287-9 of this thesis.

who had taken this role assisted in the work of memorial reconstruction. I shall show in my section on the Quarto of Henry V that the parts of Exeter and Gower cannot well have been doubled, and also that a third actor was probably concerned in the memorial reconstruction.

In 1922 Dr Greg laid the second of his foundation-stones. In that year the Malone Society issued, as an extra volume, his "Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements: The Battle of Alcazar and Orlando Furioso". In the second part of this work the author made a meticulous analysis of the Quarto text of Orlando Furioso (published 1594) along with the extant 'part' of Orlando. He found that the Quarto represents a text "severely abridged by the excision of scenes, speeches and passages of dialogue, as well as by compression and the omission of characters, for performance by a reduced cast in a strictly limited time" (pp. 133-4). He shows that the text "has been adapted, by the insertion of episodes of rough clownage and horseplay, to the tastes of a lower class of audience" (p. 134), and suggests that the bulk of the alterations "represent a gradual adaptation of the play to altered circumstances in the course of repeated acting. Thus the quarto contains what would appear to be essentially a stage version: the text is dependent on, not antecedent to, actual performance. Moreover, the text is not even the result of bringing the original playhouse copy into accordance with the current stage version, but is based almost throughout on reconstruction from memory,

while there seems likewise to be an oral link in the transmission" (op. cit. p. 134). Dr Greg also finds that "the copy used for the printed quarto was in the first instance prepared for play-house use" (do.).

On pp. 352-7 Greg reconstructs the text-history of the play. The Queen's Men seem to have acquired it in 1591; about the end of 1592 or the earlier part of 1593, being in a precarious financial condition, they appear to have sold several of their plays. Orlando was acquired from them by Alleyn, who was at the time acting with the Strange company. The Queen's Men, however, continued to perform the play in the provinces, although they no longer possessed the manuscript. Their fortunes continued to deteriorate, and they seem to have been forced gradually to get rid of their hirelings; thus constant readjustment was necessary in the text, for performance by a diminishing cast. Further alteration was made necessary by the greater popularity of comic material and the unpopularity of heroics. Thus the comic portions of the play were developed, and the more serious parts cut down. Constant acting led to progressive corruption which could not be regulated inasmuch as the company had no prompt-copy. And owing to "the frequent rearrangement of parts to the capacities of a diminishing company" many of the actors were "forced to learn their speeches by ear in the course of rehearsal" (op. cit. p. 354). Finally, it became convenient to the company to have a prompt-book. "All the members who had a working knowledge of the play met together and, having secured the services of a



ready writer, proceeded in turn to dictate their parts as well as their memories would allow" (p. 354). Here, then, we have a memorial reconstruction effected by a company of actors stranded in the provinces without acting copy.

While Dr Greg was working towards this conclusion with regard to the text of Orlando Furioso, Mr R. Crompton Rhodes was independently working towards a similar explanation of the 'bad' Quartos of Romeo and Juliet, Henry V, The Merry Wives of Windsor, and Hamlet. In his Shakespeare's First Folio (1923) Mr Crompton Rhodes advances the theory "that certain Players turned strollers, profiting by the accidental retention of their parts, and constructing the rest from memory, made prompt-books for the companies they joined" (p. 83). He proceeds:

The only simple explanation of the four quartos is that (i) it was a prompt-book used by the strolling players, (ii) each was prepared by some actor who had played a part in Shakespeare's play in the Lord Chamberlain's Company in London, (iii) the basis of each version was this accurate part, the rest being constructed from memory, most fully in scenes where he had played, (iv) the traces of shorthand in certain plays is due to the pirate's dictation to a confederate, (v) the abridgement was less deliberate than determined by his failure of memory, (vi) the versions (except possibly The Merry Wives) were subsequent to the Folio version, (vii) the stationers were not at all concerned in the piracy, but only in the printing.

(p. 83)

One may disagree with certain details here, apart from the question of whether there are any "traces of stenography". It is incredible that Q1 Romeo and Juliet was constructed by a single actor: no part is consistently good, no part is consistently bad, and no part is consistently better than any other. What

"accurate part" formed the "basis" of this reconstruction? Again, there are in the Quarto of Henry V definite traces of deliberate abridgement. But, taken generally, Mr Crompton Rhodes' hypothesis is eminently reasonable and deserves serious consideration.

In his researches on Sheridan Mr Rhodes has discovered evidence of memorial reconstruction for provincial performances at that later time. This evidence is to be found in two articles in the Times Literary Supplement, 1925, pp. 599 and 617; in Mr Rhodes' edition of Sheridan's plays and poems (1928), Vol. I, pp. 255-68 and Vol. II, pp. 162-4; and in a paper on "Some Aspects of Sheridan Bibliography" in The Library, 4th Series, Vol. IX (1928-9), pp. 233 seq.

Of particular interest are two cases of piracy of Sheridan plays for provincial performance, where the pirates themselves have left on record accounts of their methods of reconstruction. Both reconstructions were made for unauthorized performances.

In his Wandering Patentee (1795), Tate Wilkinson, manager of the Theatre Royal, York, tells how, having tried in vain to acquire a copy of The Duenna from Harris (the patentee of Convent Garden Theatre), he constructed a version of his own, which was first produced on Easter Monday, 1776. This pirated version subsequently received many performances. Mr Crompton Rhodes quotes Wilkinson's own account of the procedure he adopted (Library, IX, pp. 240-1):-

The fashion of not publishing is quite modern, and the favourite pieces not being printed, but kept under lock and key, is of infinite prejudice to us poor devils in the

country theatres, as we really cannot afford to pay for the purchase of MSS. The only time I ever exercised my pen on such an occasion was on a trial of necessity. Mr Harris bought that excellent comic opera of The Duenna from Mr Sheridan. I saw it several times, and finding it impossible to move Mr Harris's tenderness, I locked myself up in a room, set down first the jokes I remembered, then I laid a book of the songs before me, and with magazines kept the regulation of the scenes, and by the help of a numerous collection of obsolete Spanish plays I produced an excellent opera; I may say excellent -- and an unprecedented compilement; for whenever Mr Younger, or any other country manager wanted a copy of The Duenna, Mr Harris told them they might play Mr Wilkinson's: hundreds have seen it in every town in Great Britain and Ireland.

Secondly, Mr Crompton Rhodes quotes the account given by an actor, John Bernard, of his method of reconstructing The School for Scandal for an unauthorized performance at Exeter in 1779.

The account appears in Bernard's Retrospections of the Stage (1832) and is quoted by Rhodes in the article in the T.L.S., 1925, p.617.

Bernard tells how Hughes, the manager of the theatre at Exeter,

wanted a powerful novelty, and proposed The School for Scandal, then new and greatly discussed. Its success at Bath had dispersed its fame about the West of England, and it was highly probable that, if the play were produced at Exeter, it would run a number of nights to full houses. But the Comedy was not yet published and the managers who had copies of it, had obtained them on condition that they did not permit the same to become the parents of others.... Under these circumstances I offered to attempt a compilation of the comedy, if Mr Hughes would give me his word that the manuscript should be destroyed at the end of the season. This was agreed to, and I set about my task in the following manner. I had played Sir Benjamin at Bath and Charles at Richmond, and went on for Sir Peter one or two evenings when Edwin was indisposed; thus I had three parts in my possession. Dimond and Blissit (Joseph and Sir Oliver) transmitted theirs by post, on conveying the assurance to them which Mr Hughes had to me. Old Rowley was in the Company, and my wife had played both Lady Teazle and Mrs Candour. With these materials for a groundwork, my general knowledge of the play collected in rehearsing and performing in it above forty times, enabled me in a week to construct a comedy in five acts, called,

in imitation of the original, The School for Scandal.  
 Result, the public not being let into the secret the play drew crowded houses twice a week to the end of the season.

We find, then, that just as Shakespeare's company withheld their plays from publication as long as possible in order to prevent piracy, so also in the case of some of Sheridan's plays: and piratical attacks were successfully carried out against both, despite these precautions. And the methods which we know Wilkin-son and Bernard to have used are similar to those which we can assume in memorial reconstruction in the Elizabethan period.

On the twin foundations of Dr Greg's investigation of Orlando Furioso and Mr Crompton Rhodes' work on Sheridan rests Professor Peter Alexander's important contribution to the study of 'bad' Quartos. In 1594 and 1595 respectively there were published two Quartos entitled The First part of the Contention betwixt the two famous Houses of Yorke and Lancaster and The True Tragedie of Richard Duke of Yorke, and the death of good King Henrie the Sixt. Professor Alexander shows, in my view quite conclusively, that the texts given in these Quartos represent, not 1 and 2 Henry VI at a stage in their development anterior to that of the Folio texts, but memorial reconstructions of these texts themselves, or of texts extremely close to them.<sup>1</sup> The demonstration of this hypo-

---

1. Alexander (and his predecessor J. S. Smart) include The Taming of A Shrew (Q 1594) in the same category. This matter will receive full discussion in my Appendix on "The Problem of 'The Taming of A Shrew'".



thesis had been begun by the late Dr John Semple Smart,<sup>1</sup> whose work Alexander has continued and developed. The 'bad Quarto theory' is not new. In his Dissertation on the Three Parts of King Henry VI Malone wrote as follows:

It has long been a received opinion that the two quarto plays.....were spurious and imperfect copies of Shakespeare's Second and Third Part of King Henry VI.; and many passages have been quoted in the notes to the late editions of Shakespeare as containing merely the various readings of the quartos and the folio: the passages have been supposed to be in substance the same, only variously exhibited in different copies. The variations have been accounted for, by supposing that the imperfect and spurious copies (as they were called) were taken down either by an unskilful short-hand writer, or by some auditor, who picked up "during the representation what the time would permit, then filled up some of his omissions at a second or third hearing, and when he had by this method formed something like a play, sent it to the printer". To this opinion. I with others for a long time subscribed.<sup>2</sup>

But Malone finally dismissed this hypothesis, and formed the opinion that the Quartos represent "not spurious and imperfect copies of Shakespeare's pieces, but elder dramas on which he formed his Second and Third Part of King Henry VI."<sup>3</sup> These "elder dramas" are un-Shakespearian.

The grounds on which Malone founded this theory scarcely stand examination. He points out, for example, that

in some places a speech in one of these quartos consists of ten or twelve lines. In Shakespeare's folio the same speech consists of perhaps only half the number. A copyist by the ear, or an unskilful short-hand writer, might

1. Shakespeare, Truth and Tradition (1928) pp. 191 seq.
2. I quote from pp. 577-8 of Vol. XVIII of the 1821 edition.
3. *ibid.* p. 578.

mutilate and exhibit a poet's thoughts or expressions imperfectly; but would he dilate and amplify them, or introduce totally new matter? Assuredly he would not.<sup>1</sup>

But Mommsen<sup>2</sup> and Creizenach<sup>3</sup> would have had an answer to this; as regards the 1st Quartos of Romeo and Juliet and Hamlet, Mommsen suggested that an inferior poet supplemented, largely by his own invention, imperfect reports of the Shakespearian versions. Creizenach advanced the same view of Q1 Hamlet.

What Malone regarded as "the chief hinge" of his argument was an interpretation of a passage in Greene which Smart and Alexander show to have been a mistaken one. Greene includes in his Groatsworth of Wit (1592) an epistle entitled "To those Gentlemen his Quondam acquaintance, that spend their wits in making plaies, R. G. wisheth a better exercise, and wisdom to preuent his extremities". In this epistle Greene warns those whom he is addressing against trusting the actors for whom he had written plays and who have now deserted him in his poverty and illness. He calls the actors "those Puppets.....that spake from our mouths, those Anticks garnisht in our colours". And he proceeds:

Is it not strange, that I, to whom they all haue been beholding: is it not like that you, to whome they all haue been beholding, shall (were yee in that case as I

- 
1. Vol. XVIII of the 1821 edition, p. 578.
  2. The Athenaeum, 1857, p. 182.
  3. Shakespeare Jahrbuch, Vol. XLII, pp. 76 seq.

am now) bee both at once of them forsaken? Yes trust them not: for there is an upstart Crow, beautified with our feathers, that with his "Tygers hart wrapt in a Players hyde", supposes he is as well able to bombast out a blanke verse as the best of you: and beeing an absolute Iohannes fac totum, is in his owne conceit the onely Shake-scene in a countrey....

The word "Shake-scene" obviously contains a reference to Shakespeare: and Malone interpreted the passage as a charge of plagiarism. He contended that

Greene and Peele were the joint authors of the two quarto plays.....or that Greene was the author of one and Peele of the other.... (Shakespeare) having...probably not long before the year 1592...new-modelled and amplified these two pieces, and produced on the stage what, in the folio edition of his works, are called The Second and Third Parts of King Henry VI and having acquired considerable reputation by them, Greene could not conceal the mortification that he felt at his own fame and that of his associate, both of them old and admired play-wrights, being eclipsed by a new upstart writer, (for so he calls our great poet), who had then first, perhaps, attracted the notice of the publick by exhibiting two plays, formed upon old dramas written by them, considerably enlarged and improved.

The "Tygers hart wrapt in a Players hyde" is a modification of a line found in both The True Tragedie (I iv 122) and III Henry VI (I iv 137) -- "O tiger's heart wrapp'd in a woman's hide".

Malone's view is that Greene charges Shakespeare

with having acted like the crow in the fable, beautified himself with their feathers; in other words, with having acquired fame furtivis coloribus, by new-modelling a work originally produced by them (i.e. Greene and Peele), and wishing to depreciate our author, he very naturally quotes a line from one of the pieces which Shakespeare had thus re-written; a proceeding which the authors of the original plays considered as an invasion both of their literary property and character. This line, with many others, Shakespeare adopted without any alteration.

Apart from the 'bad Quarto theory' there is yet another view of the relationship between the Contention quartos and the

Folio plays. Courthope quotes Grant White who reckoned that "more than 3400 lines in the Second and Third Parts of Henry VI are taken bodily from, or based upon passages in, The Contention and True Tragedy". This naturally leads White to point out that "if Shakespeare stole all these, his undisguised appropriations brand him with a plagiarism without a parallel in literary history". This he considered "inconsistent alike with his established character for probity and the spontaneous fertility of his pen". So White evolved the following hypothesis: Shakespeare, Greene, Marlowe, and possibly Peele, collaborated in writing the 1st Contention and True Tragedy for Pembroke's Company; later, when Shakespeare became exclusively connected with Strange's company he rewrote these plays, "rejecting the parts contributed by his former co-labourers, and retaining his own contributions, with such additions and amendments as might be expected from any writer upon the revision of a work produced in his earlier years of authorship". But Courthope thought that even on this hypothesis Shakespeare would be guilty of a plagiarism he found unthinkable -- a "gross plagiarism of ideas". Further, he thought Greene's language in his attack on Shakespeare far too mild to be taken as referring to plagiarism of this extent. To him Greene's words "naturally interpreted....seem to express the apprehensions of a jealous rival who warns his associates that Shakespeare has copied the new blank verse style which they have introduced on the stage, and is likely to develop it in such a manner as to deprive them of their popularity". Anxious



to absolve Shakespeare from any direct charge of plagiarism, Courthope is forced into the position of regarding the 1594 and 1595 Quartos as his own first drafts, which he subsequently revised into the texts found in the 1623 Folio.

But Smart and Alexander point to a far more probable interpretation of Greene's words than those of Malone or Courthope. An attentive reading of the Greene epistle points directly to the conclusion that the "upstart Crow beautified with our feathers" and the "Puppets that spake from our mouths, those Anticks garnisht in our colours" are in fact the same people -- or rather, that the upstart crow is one of the said puppets. "Greene had a long-standing grievance against actors," says Alexander, "and had already in 1590, in his Never Too Late, complained that the performer, who merely repeats the lines of an abler brain, makes far more than the author; and he addressed one individual in terms which are very similar to those employed in the letter:

Why Roscius, art thou proud with Esops Crow, being pranc't  
with the glorie of others feathers? of thy selfe thou  
canst say nothing.....".<sup>1</sup>

The name "Roscius" shows clearly that it is an actor who is being addressed here. Now, the imagery is the same in both passages; so is the thought. In the attack on Shakespeare, Greene assails him as the actor who imagines himself able to turn author. The result is, of course, that the company to which such a one is

---

1. Shakespeare's 'Henry VI' and 'Richard III', p. 43.

attached will need to depend less upon the "professional author" like Greene himself. This is doubtless what was in the latter's mind; there is no charge of plagiarism at all, nor is Greene's attack on Shakespeare any obstacle to the 'bad Quarto theory' of the 1st Contention and True Tragedy, a theory which has won wide acceptance.

Tycho Mommsen<sup>1</sup> regarded these two Quartos in the same light as the first Quartos of Romeo and Juliet and Hamlet; they are mutilated, deformed, and interpolated, versions of the corresponding Shakespearian plays as given in the subsequently published authorised editions. Mommsen also realised that we must dismiss any theory of the development of Shakespeare's dramatic art which is based on a comparison of these spurious editions with the authentic ones on the assumption that the texts of the former ante-date those of the latter. Professor Alexander's work shows that as far as the Henry VI Quartos are concerned Mommsen was right. Professor Pollard reiterates the same principle in his introduction to Alexander's book (p. 6). Further, as Pollard points out, against Malone, "as regards parallels and reminiscences and quotations from other plays which had recently been acted there is no reason to ask how these got into memorial reconstructions. From the very nature of the case a vamped text would be likely to contain phrases and even lines from other

---

1. Romeo und Julia, eine kritische Ausgabe des überlieferten Doppeltextes: Prolegomena, V, pp. 158-9.

plays in which its authors had lately been acting". If the 1st Contention and True Tragedy are memorial reconstructions, we cannot argue from stylistic resemblances to the works of authors other than Shakespeare that these authors had a hand in their composition. It is impossible to lay too much stress on the importance of taking into account the manner of the transmission of the text in deciding the significance of passages found in a 'bad' text and not in the corresponding authentic text. The most flagrant error which has been made in this connection is that of F. S. Boas and J. M. Robertson, who profess to find in the 1st Quarto of Hamlet certain definite traces of Kyd's play. The evidence for this view is the existence in the pirated text of a considerable number of very close parallels to passages in undoubted works of Kyd;<sup>1</sup> indeed most of these parallels are direct quotations or appropriations. It is curious that Professor Boas should claim for Kyd "inventive dramatic craftsmanship"<sup>2</sup> while apparently maintaining that he was prone to write exactly the same speeches in similar situations in different plays. Neither Boas nor Robertson pays sufficient attention to the problem of the transmission of the Q1 text. Once it is established as a memorial reconstruction made by an actor or actors

1. Boas, Works of Kyd (1901) intro. pp. xlix-liii. Robertson, The Problem of Hamlet (1919) pp. 33-41.

2. Op. cit. p. liv.

(perhaps with other assistance) the true significance of these parallels appears obvious. Passages from other plays are transferred to this one, either deliberately, to fill in gaps due to defective memory on the part of the reporter(s), or involuntarily, through memorial confusion between similar situations in different plays which are basically of the same type. In the case of the 1st Contention and the True Tragedy Alexander finally puts out of court both of the views held before, viz. that enunciated by Malone, that the Folio texts of 2 and 3 Henry VI are Shakespearian revisions of the Contention plays which are the work of other writers, and that enunciated by Courthope, who, anxious to remove from Shakespeare all guilt of plagiarism, even of ideas, regarded the Contention plays as Shakespeare's own first drafts, which he later revised into 2 and 3 Henry VI. Furthermore, Alexander regards the Contention Quartos as members of the same class of text as the Quarto of Orlando Furioso, vamped up by a remnant of an acting company, deprived of prompt-copy, and anxious to continue performing in the provinces.<sup>1</sup> Orlando is not a unique case: it is one example of a certain type of text, of which we also possess other examples. We may sum up by saying that the establishment of the "Orlando" class of "bad" Quartos is the most important development which has so far taken place in the study of Elizabethan and Jacobean pirated texts.

---

1. For an account of the circumstances in which these memorial reconstructions were made, see my Appendix on "The Problem of 'The Taming of Shrew'", pp. 570 seq..





IV. FIRST SKETCHES, or DEBASED VERSIONS OF  
THE 'GOOD' TEXTS?

When we possess both a memorial reconstruction of a play and one or more authorized editions, we must be exceedingly careful in the inferences we draw from passages or characteristics peculiar to the former. The question in such cases is, do the memorial reconstructions represent the plays as found in the authorized editions, or do they represent them at a distinct stage in their text-history? In other words, when we have to deal with a memorial reconstruction we must face the problem, of what is it a memorial reconstruction?

Before we accept any divergence between a memorial reconstruction and an authorized version of the same play as indicating that behind the former lies a stage of the play's history anterior to that given in the latter, we must be sure that the divergence in question did not arise in the process of the transmission itself. When it is remembered that a reconstructor's memory may fail and that in such a case he may attempt to supply the deficiency by his own invention, the dangers of rushing at the above conclusion become apparent. I would exemplify under four heads the difficulty of the problem, to what cause are such divergences due.

Inferiority of Reading.

All the Shakespearian 'bad' Quartos contain scores of readings which are clearly inferior to the corresponding readings of

the authorized editions. Are we to suppose that between the versions underlying the two sets of texts there stands a Shakespearian revision, in the course of which superior readings were substituted? Such an assumption cannot be made a priori, in view of the fact that defective memory may well lead a pirate to substitute a common word for a more vital and original one. The inadvisability of using inferiority of readings in 'bad' Quartos as proof that these represent earlier versions than the authentic texts of the same plays is nowhere more strikingly exemplified than in Brinsley Nicholson's analysis of the Quarto of Henry V from this point of view.<sup>1</sup> He lists an imposing number of Quarto readings which are certainly inferior to those of the Folio, and springs to the conclusion that the Quarto represents a Shakespearian first sketch, without however noticing that many of these 'inferior' readings are in fact reminiscences and anticipations of earlier and later passages in the play, introduced by memorial association during the course of the compilation of the Quarto text.<sup>2</sup>

#### Non-Shakespearian Verse.

Some of the Shakespearian 'bad' Quartos contain a certain amount of quite metrical verse which bears no relation to the corresponding passages in the authoritative editions. This verse is often composed in a conventional and even archaic style

1. Transactions of the New Shakespeare Society, 1880-2, pp. 77 seq.

2. See infra pp. 224 seq..

nowhere used by Shakespeare even in his earliest plays. Is it then to be explained as belonging to a pre-Shakespearian stage of the history of the play concerned? Not necessarily; for as regards the 1st Quartos of Romeo and Hamlet, Mommsen argued for the existence of a hack-poet who supplemented the imperfect notes of a reporter by his own composition.<sup>1</sup> And I have been able to show that some of this verse in these two 'bad' Quartos certainly contains reminiscences of many passages scattered throughout the corresponding 'good' texts.<sup>2</sup> Thus it would appear that at least some of the non-Shakespearian verse in these 'bad' Quartos was written by someone who knew the plays in question, and brought together various fragments, fusing them into respectably metrical verse. That is to say, this verse came into existence during the process of the transmission of the 'bad' texts, and owes nothing to any authentic version of the plays concerned.

#### Characterisation.

By similar reasoning we may claim that where there is an apparent difference in characterisation between a memorial reconstruction and the corresponding authentic text this need not necessarily mean that the two texts represent different stages in the play's development. Thus Herford, in his *Harness Essay* (1880), points out that in the 2nd Quarto and the Folio of Hamlet the King

---

1. The Athenaeum, 1857, p. 182.

2. See infra pp. 112 seq. and 322 seq..

is a much more complex character than in the first Quarto, where his guilt is portrayed crudely and directly, unmixed with the subtleties of characterisation found in the authentic texts. Comparing Q2 with Q1 Herford talks of the former's "touches of the high art which allows no contrast to be too absolute; which relieves the unvaried shadows of the younger painter with subtle half-lights, and tones down his glaring whites with delicate shade".<sup>1</sup> But before we can be sure of this interpretation, which implies that the Claudius of Q1 is a less complex first attempt, we must be quite sure that the change is not from the character of Q2 to that of Q1 by deterioration. And this is a very likely view; for it is quite possible that a memorial reconstructor should be unable to appreciate or to reproduce the subtle complexities of the Shakespearian characterization, and should simplify the character, thus producing the crude villainy of the King in the 1st Quarto. Similarly with Hamlet himself. Herford and Furnivall make much of the fact that in Q1 he is much less individually philosophical, much more theologically orthodox: but it is precisely the difficult philosophical reflections of the character found in Q2 and F1 that we should expect a memorial reconstructor to be intellectually incapable of coping with. The memorial reconstruction was in all probability carried out by an actor or actors; such practical men of the theatre would almost

---

1. Quoted by Furnivall, Griggs facsimile of Q2 Hamlet, intro. p. xiii.



certainly be much more interested in definite action than in complex reflection. Unless we find more definite corroboration of the theory that cruder characterisation in a memorial reconstruction suggests dependence on a version earlier than that of the corresponding authorized edition(s) we must always be prepared to acknowledge the distinct possibility that the manner of the transmission of the former is itself sufficient to account for the difference. We shall find that although much of the 'evidence' used by Herford, Furnivall, etc., to suggest that the Gertrude of Q1 is an earlier character than she of Q2 is useless inasmuch as it does not take the method of transmission into account, there is some evidence that their view is correct.<sup>1</sup> Where the words of Belimperia are put into the mouth of Gertrude we have no evidence at all of an earlier Gertrude than that of Q2: the memorial reconstructor(s) are themselves responsible. But where the Q1 Gertrude expresses an attitude peculiar to that text in words which are closely parallel to a passage in Belleforest, our suspicions are indeed aroused. Even so, we might adopt the explanation of Ramello,<sup>2</sup> who suggests that the memorial reconstructor himself consulted Belleforest. But this seems a rather desperate effort to evade the obvious conclusion. At least that conclusion must be entertained as a very likely hypothesis.

---

1. See infra pp. 177 seq..

2. Studi sugli Apocrifi Shakespeariani: Hamlet 1603 (1930), pp. 174-6.

Omission.

This is perhaps among the greatest problems connected with pirated texts. Omission may, of course, result from defective memorial transmission. On the other hand, it may be argued that certain omissions are not strictly omissions at all, Shakespeare having added passages during revision; or, secondly, omissions may be due to deliberate excision in an acting abridgement. It is established that actors played a large part in the extant memorial reconstructions. Naturally, what they reconstruct is the play as acted, which is not necessarily the play as it appears in the authorized edition(s). Speaking generally, it is exceedingly difficult to distinguish between omissions due to these various factors. But it must be quite clear that the total absence of a passage from a 'bad' Quarto does not necessarily imply that that passage did not stand in the full version of the play which underlies the piracy.

Problems such as these arise whenever we have both a pirated and an authorized edition of the same text; and it is with four such cases that we shall be concerned in the following study.

---

THE FIRST QUARTO OF 'HAMLET'.

## INTRODUCTION.

### THE MAIN CONTROVERSY.

Since the discovery of the 1603 edition of Hamlet by Sir Henry E. Bunbury in 1821, Shakespearian criticism has been agitated by the problem of what stage of the play's history underlies the text of that edition. The question is still debated, without very much general agreement. The hypotheses which have been advanced may in the first instance be grouped under two main headings: (1) that behind Q1 lies a version of the play anterior to that given in Q2; (2) that the Q1 text is based solely on the version of the play found in Q2, variations from the latter post-dating it. This is a broad preliminary classification; sub-division is necessary.

I. The hypothesis that Q1 represents a version of the play distinct from and anterior to that given in Q2. This may be sub-divided under two headings:

- (a) The copy discovered by Bunbury was reprinted in 1825, when it was described as the "only known copy of this tragedy as originally written by Shakespeare, which he afterwards altered and enlarged". This view is maintained by the following critics and editors: Singer (editions of 1826 and 1856), Caldecott (edition of 1832, preface to Hamlet, p. vi), Knight (see 1st edition -- undated: ?1841 -- Vol. VI, Introductory Notice to Hamlet, pp. 87-92), an anonymous



writer in the Edinburgh Review, Vol. LXXXI, pp. 378 seq.), Hunter (New Illustrations of Shakespeare, 1845, Vol. II, pp. 202 seq.), Elze (edition of 1857, Hamlet, Einleitung, pp. xix seq.), Timmins (preface to Allen's reprint of Qq. 1 and 2, 1860), Gervinus (Shakespeare Commentaries, translated by Bunnett, 1863, Vol. II, pp. 108-9), Staunton (edition of 1864, Vol. IV, pp. 99-100), Delius (edition of 1865), Dyce (edition of 1866, Vol. VII, pp. 100-1), Furnivall (introductions to Griggs facsimiles of Q1 and Q2, 1880), George MacDonald ("The Tragedie of Hamlet, Prince of Denmarke. A Study, with the Text of the Folio of 1623", 1885, republished 1924), T. Rochfort-Smith ("The Relation of the First Quarto of 'Hamlet' to the Second", summarised in the Transactions of the New Shakspeare Society, Part II, 1880-5, pp. 50-1), Swinburne (A Study of Shakespeare, p. 161), Dowden (introduction, Arden edition of Hamlet, first published 1889, pp. xvii-xix), E. Deckner ("Die beiden ersten Hamlet-Quartos", Normannia, IV. Berlin, 1909).

- (b) A more complex hypothesis regards the version of the play underlying Q1 as a transition-play, intermediate between an Ur-Hamlet by Kyd and Shakespeare's final version as given in Q2. Behind Q1 lies a partial Shakespearian revision of the Kyd play; the full revision underlies the Q2 text. Here we may group the following critics: W. G. Clark and W. Aldis Wright (Clarendon Press edition, preface to Hamlet, 1872, pp. viii seq.), Widgery and Herford (Harness Prize

Essays, 1880), Corbin ("The German 'Hamlet' and the Earlier English Versions", *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, V (1896) pp. 245-60), Boas (*Works of Kyd*, 1901, introduction, pp. xlv-liv), J. M. Robertson (*The problem of 'Hamlet'*, 1919), J. Dover Wilson ("The 'Copy' for 'Hamlet', 1603" and "The 'Hamlet' Transcript, 1593", *The Library*, 3rd series, Vol. IX (1918), pp. 153-85, 217-47), G. B. Harrison (Bodley Head reprint of Q1, 1923, introduction, pp. xxviii seq.), Stoll (*Modern Philology*, Vol. XXXV (1937-8), pp. 31 seq.), Parrott and Hardin Craig (edition of Q2, 1938, introduction).<sup>1</sup>

W. J. Lawrence must occupy a category by himself; he believes that the Q1 text is based on the Ur-Hamlet, but that it contains infiltrations introduced by the reporter from the full

- 
1. Mention should be made here of H. de Groot (*'Hamlet' Its Textual History*, 1923). He does not believe that Q1 is a reported text. His theory is as follows: Kyd wrote the Ur-Hamlet; Shakespeare partially revised it; an adapter shortened this Kyd-Shakespeare MS., and this shortened MS. was the 'copy' for Q1. Before the Kyd-Shakespeare MS. was shortened Shakespeare revised it a second time, writing a new MS. This new MS. was the 'copy' for Q2. A copy of Q2 was used as the prompt-book, and from this F1 was set up after Heminge and Con-dell had "edited" the text. It should be noted that F. G. Hubbard also denies that Q1 is a reported text. He considers that it gives an authentic reproduction of a version of the play distinct from and anterior to that given in the other editions (*The First Quarto Edition of Shakespeare's 'Hamlet'*, *Wisconsin Univ. Studies in Language and Literature*, 1920).

Shakespearian play (see Shakespeare's Workshop, 1928, pp. 110-23).

II. The hypothesis that the Q1 text is based on that given in Q2: features peculiar to Q1 post-date the Q2 text and may be the result of either of two factors -- (1) imperfect reporting, or (2) deliberate alteration.

The first critic to advance the theory that Q1 represents a version of the play essentially the same as that of Q2 was Collier (edition of 1843, Vol. VII, introduction to Hamlet, p. 191); he argued that the greater part of the Q1 text was transmitted via a stenographer, and suggested that where his notes were defective he either filled the gaps badly from memory or obtained assistance from an "inferior writer". The theory that a third-rate poet filled up gaps in an imperfect report of performances of a version of the play not essentially different from that given in Q2 is also associated with the names of Tycho Mommsen (Athenaeum, 1857, p. 182), Creizenach ("Hamlet-fragen" II: Shakespeare Jahrbuch, Vol. XLII (1906) pp. 76-85), and H. D. Gray (Modern Language Review, Vol. X (1915), pp. 171 seq., and Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, Vol. XLII (1927), pp. 721 seq.). Creizenach agrees with Collier that the reporting was stenographic; Mommsen suggests that the reporter was probably "an actor, who put down from memory a sketch of the original play as it was acted, and who wrote very illegibly"; Gray identifies the pirate-actor as

having played the parts of Marcellus and Lucianus.

Three critics who come under category II assert emphatically that the Q1 text not only post-dates that given in Q2, but represents a deliberate stage-adaptation of that text. Alterations of Q2 in this stage-adaptation are emphasised by William Poel (Notes and Queries, series 12, Vol. XI (1922), pp. 301-3) and R. Crompton Rhodes (Shakespeare's First Folio, 1923, pp. 72-83). Abridgement is also postulated; and Alfred Hart is especially concerned with abridgement, maintaining that the reporter was an actor who had taken part in an official abridgement of the Q2 text (see Review of English Studies, Vol. X (1934) pp. 1-28, and Vol. XII (1936) pp. 18-30, and the chapters on Play Abridgement in Shakespeare and the Homilies). Mention should be made here of F. P. von Westenholz (Englische Studien, Vol. XXXIV (1904), pp. 337-50): while he does not believe that Q1 is a pirated text, he considers that its text post-dates that of Q2, being an abridged adaptation of that, made for a provincial tour.

Amongst other critics who hold that the Q1 text depends on that of Q2 are Gustav Tanger (Transactions of the New Shakspeare Society, 1880-2, Part I, pp. 109-97) and B. A. P. Van Dam (The Text of Shakespeare's 'Hamlet', 1924, Chapter 1). Both regard Q1 as a shorthand report. Tanger emphasises the responsibility of the stenographer for the majority of the differences between Q1 and Q2. Van Dam attributes a great proportion of these to the actors.



The view that the Q1 text post-dates that of Q2 is also held by R. Grant White (intro. to Hamlet, edition of 1861, pp. 10 seq.), E. K. Chambers (William Shakespeare, 1930, Vol. I, pp. 412 seq.), Giovanni Ramello (Studi sugli Apocrifi Shakespeariani: 'Hamlet' 1603 (1930)), and V. Østerberg (Studier over Hamlet-texterne I (Copenhagen, 1920) and Prince Hamlet's Age (do., 1924: see especially pp. 34-6)).<sup>1</sup>

Reference has already been made to H. D. Gray as holding that the Q1 text is based on a version not essentially different from that of Q2. He believes, however, that between the version behind Q1 and that of Q2 Shakespeare may have touched up or altered a point here and there (e.g. the change of the names Corambis and Montano to Polonius and Reynaldo). He emphasises, however, that no substantial change was made. This was also the view of W. G. Clark and W. Aldis Wright (The Cambridge Shakespeare, Vol. VIII (1866), see especially pp. ix-x): they think that between the versions represented by Q1 and Q2 "no substantial change was made, and that the chief differences

---

1. Cf. also W. W. Greg, Principles of Emendation in Shakespeare (British Academy Shakespeare Lecture, 1928), reprinted in Aspects of Shakespeare, 1933. See Aspects, p. 148. He takes as a basis for his discussion the theory that "the 'good' second quarto was printed direct from Shakespeare's autograph, that the folio was printed from a playhouse manuscript copied from that autograph, which had undergone certain alteration in the course of two decades of constant use as a prompt-book, and that the 'bad' first quarto is in the main based upon a representation of the play, the actors' parts for which had been transcribed from the same prompt-copy in its original state." The Q1 text therefore/

between Q1 and Q2 are only such as might be expected between a bona fide, and a mala fide, transcription" (p. x). These editors should therefore be included in this category. I would also include M. R. Ridley (New Temple ed. of Hamlet, 1934). Although he regards certain differences between Q1 and Q2 (e.g. the change of names) as pointing to a certain amount of revision between them, he emphasises strongly the closeness of the version of the play underlying Q1 and that given in Q2.

---

therefore post-dates that of Q2. But Dr Greg is very cautious, warning the reader that he does not necessarily accept this theory.

SECTION I.

THE COMPOSITE NATURE OF THE 'COPY'.

---

In two important articles in The Library, 3rd series, Vol. IX (1918)<sup>1</sup> Professor Dover Wilson argued that the 'copy' for the 1st Quarto of Hamlet is composite. The basic stratum consists, according to his hypothesis, of an abridged transcript of the so-called Ur Hamlet at a stage when it was only partially revised by Shakespeare. The second stratum consists of interpolations made from memory by an actor who had played a number of small parts<sup>2</sup> in the fully revised play. This theory has recently been revived by Parrott and Hardin Craig, in the introduction to their edition of the 2nd Quarto (1938).

There are decided objections against this explanation of the condition of the 1st Quarto text, some of which will concern us in the second section of this study. But that there are certain points where the 'copy' was composite I have not the slightest doubt. I propose to discuss a number of these passages somewhat fully; and I shall confine my attention to cases where actual textual dislocation suggests the presence of an interpolator making additions to a first stratum of text.

- 
1. The Copy for 'Hamlet' 1603, pp. 153-85, and The 'Hamlet' Transcript, 1593, pp. 217-47.
  2. Viz. those of Marcellus, Voltemand, a Player, the Captain, the second Gravedigger, the Priest, and one of the English Ambassadors.



## I.

Q1 SCENE 14:THE DIALOGUE BETWEEN HORATIO AND THE QUEEN.

We may usefully begin by considering this short scene of 36 lines, peculiar to the first Quarto, for it has not to my knowledge been examined from the bibliographical point of view before. Three blocks of text can be distinguished: the first 17 lines are metrically regular and correctly divided; the same is true of the last ten. Between lies a passage of nine lines in which the metre and line-division are disturbed. It will be our business to attempt to discover the reason for this structural disturbance.

The irregular passage is printed thus in Q1:

(Hor.) To morrow morning.

Queene O faile not, good Horatio, and withall, commend me  
A mothers care to him, bid him a while  
Be wary of his presence, lest that he  
Faile in that he goes about.

Hor. Madam, neuer make doubt of that:  
I thinke by this the news be come to court:  
He is arriv'de, obserue the king, and you shall  
Quickely finde, Hamlet being here,  
Things fell not to his minde.

Within this passage there are two separate pieces of mislineation, kept apart by Horatio's "Madam, neuer make doubt of that", which may be regarded as an extra metrum ejaculation, and the line immediately following ("I thinke by this the news be come to court") which is perfectly metrical and correctly

set up as a single line.

Immediate restoration of the correct lineation is at some points not difficult. An obvious case is:

Bid him a while be wary of his presence,  
Lest that he faile in that he goes about.

I would suggest that the line-division of this short piece of text has been disarranged by an interpolation made in its immediate neighbourhood. The words "O faile not, good Horatio" satisfactorily complete the metrical line begun by Horatio's "To morrow morning". The disarrangement is neatly accounted for if we suppose that the words "and withall, commend me a mothers care to him" constitute an interpolation. The original reading in the 'copy', according to this suggestion, was as follows:

To morrow morning.  
Queene O faile not, good Horatio,  
Bid him a while be wary of his presence,  
Lest that he faile in that he goes about.

I suggest that an interpolator wrote "and withall, commend me" in the right-hand margin immediately after "good Horatio", and "a mothers care to him" in the left-hand margin immediately before "Bid". The compositor began by following his 'copy', setting up as one line the words "O faile not, good Horatio, and withall, commend me". But after this he was faced with a huge line -- "a mothers care to him bid him a while be wary of his presence". He had already turned down the last two syllables of the preceding line, and he could not fit this long line into the available space; it looks as if he had started

with the beginning of the long line ("a mothers care...."), carefully counted five iambic feet (which brought him to the word "while"), and treated that as a line; then, beginning with "be wary" he counted another five feet, which brought him to "lest that he"; and finally he set up the remainder of the speech in a line by itself. I can see no other explanation of the obvious disarrangement in the passage.

If the above reconstruction of the original state of the text is correct, there was good reason for the making of this insertion. At the end of the scene the Queen says:

Horatio once againe I take my leaue,  
With thowsand mothers blessings to my sonne.

Not even in the quarto as it stands has she previously taken her leave. The only passage which could be taken to be a first farewell are precisely these,

and withhall, commend me a mothers care to him,

which I have suggested to be a later addition. In the original stratum of the text, if I am right, Gertrude took a second leave without having taken a first. A reviser would naturally want to remedy this by inserting at least an implied leave-taking at a suitable point. That the wording of the interpolation echoes that of part of the passage at the end which made it necessary is not surprising. The reviser read the Queen's last speech, realised the error, and, working without any manuscript by which to make corrections, inserted similar but less extravagant words earlier. To 'thowsand mothers blessings' corresponds 'a mothers care', and 'to my sonne' corresponds 'to him'.

The interpolator wrote 'care', not 'blessings'. It is possible to trace the source of this word in a complex piece of memorial association. At two points in Q1 previous to this scene a parent's 'care' for Hamlet is mentioned. At the beginning of scene 6, where Claudius welcomes Rosencrantz and Guildenstern to the court, he says:

Therefore we doe desire, euen as you tender  
Our care to him, and our great loue to you,  
That you will labour etc.

And towards the end of scene 11, when he intimates to Hamlet the impending voyage to England, he says to him:

we in care of you: but specially  
in tender preservation of your health  
The which we price euen as our proper selfe,  
It is our minde you forthwith goe for England,  
The winde sits faire, you shall aboorde to night,  
etc.

To the first passage there is no verbal parallel in the 'good' texts in Act 2 scene 2, the first 39 lines of which correspond to the first 18 of Q1 scene 6. To the second corresponds the following passage from III ii 39 ff:

King: Hamlet, this deed for thine especial safety,  
Which we do tender, as we deeply grieve  
For that which thou hast done, must send thee hence  
With fiery quickness. Therefore prepare thyself,  
The bark is ready, and the wind at help, etc.

A memorial reconstructor may confuse passages from different plays, especially where there is similar phraseology and similar situations. In Henry V II ii the following passages occur just before a sea-voyage:

line 12: Now sits the wind fair, and we will aboard.  
lines 57-8: Though Cambridge, Scroope and Grey in their  
dear care  
And tender preservation of our person, etc.



line 70: We will aboard tonight.

I would account for the Q1 version of the King's words to Hamlet in scene 11 in the following way. A memorial reconstructor was led by the occurrence of the word tender and the phrase 'The bark is ready and the wind at help' in the version he was trying to reproduce (III ii 39 ff.) to recollect the Henry V passages, where tender likewise occurs, as well as the phrase 'The wind sits fair'. In Henry V tender was an adjective, in Hamlet a verb. Owing to the confusion it became an adjective in Q1 Hamlet and the whole phrase 'tender preservation' was transferred, as well as 'The wind sits fair' and '(you) shall aboard tonight'. Tied up with these words from Henry V is the phrase 'of your health' which corresponds to the 'safety' of the Hamlet good texts; Q1's 'the which we price' is exactly parallel to 'which we do tender'; and it is not improbable that the memorial source of 'even as our proper self' is some such passage as 'Be as our self in Denmark'-Claudius' words to Hamlet in the Court-scene at I ii 122 where he is likewise apparently concerned over Hamlet's welfare. The important point for our present purpose, however, is that the word 'care' in Q1 scene 11 comes from Henry V. It is not found at all in the corresponding passage in Hamlet Q2 or F1, and the complex tissue of memorial associations suggested leaves little doubt of its source. The whole passage is a complicated memorial conflation of (a) the corresponding passage in the good texts, (b) a passage in Henry V which resembles that, and (c) another part of Hamlet

where like sentiments are expressed in like surroundings.

Even more interesting is the passage we quoted from Q1 scene 6. There neither the word 'care' nor the word 'tender' is found in the corresponding passage in Q2 and F1. 'Tender' is here a verb, just as in the later passage in the full play (III ii 40), and the present Q1 passage is obviously an anticipation of that later passage. Not only so, but the confusion of that later passage with Henry V is also anticipated, and is responsible for the occurrence of 'care' here too. It is remarkable that anticipating a later passage and a confusion of it with another play, the reconstructor should here take tender in the later Hamlet sense, while when he comes to the later passage itself he takes it in the Henry V sense. This passage in scene 6, then, (a passage which is in regular metre and printed with quite undisturbed lineation, and which has therefore presumably not been interfered with by any interpolator) is a memorial conflation of (a) a later passage in Hamlet bearing on the same assumed concern of the king for Hamlet's happiness (b) a passage in Henry v which has similarities with that later passage only. In Q1 scene 6 the word 'care' is derived unconsciously from Henry V, but that derivation is only made through the medium of another passage in Hamlet.

In this way, care got into two passages, fairly widely separated, in Q1 Hamlet. These two passages both dealt with the same subject -- parental care. The interpolator probably knew one, or both, of them. It is but a short distance from a step-father's care to "a mother's care": and so, through the agency of the

interpolating reviser, this latter phrase got into Q1 scene 14. Not only has an interpolation in the original text been detected, but both the motive for its insertion and the sources of its wording have been discovered.

The other knot of mislineation in the irregular nine-line passage consists of the following lines:-

I thinke by this the news be come to court:  
He is arriv'de, obserue the king, and you shall  
Quickely finde, Hamlet being here,  
Things fell not to his minde.

The presence of the rhyme 'finde-minde' embedded in the passage shows that originally a rhymed couplet stood at the end of this short speech. If 'finde' was at the end of a line, the last line must have been:

Hamlet being here, things fell not to his minde.

The line 'I thinke by this the news be come to court' is perfectly regular as it stands. It is therefore the line between these two which is over-long; and we may begin by rearranging the passage thus:

I thinke by this the news be come to court:  
He is arriv'de, obserue the king, and you shall quickely finde,  
Hamlet being here, things fell not to his minde.

Apart from the general improbability of one line of a final rhyming couplet containing two extra feet, the passage cannot have stood like this in the 'copy' for Q1; for had that lineation been indicated the compositor would have set it up so, tucking the end of the long line into the space at the end of the following one with a bracket. Clearly an interpolation has been made in the original stratum of the 'copy' in such a way that the

compositor could not see the correct lineation.

If at the outset we wished to make the original stratum read as intelligibly as possible with the material given in the Quarto, we might conjecture that it read thus:

I thinke by this the news be come to court:  
 Obserue the king, and you shall quickly finde,  
 Hamlet being here, things fell not to his minde.

This is perfectly coherent, and correctly constructed. The interpolator would on this assumption have inserted the phrase 'He is arriv'de'.

But why should such an interpolation have been made at all? In the previous case we considered there was a good reason in a bad inconsistency in the first stratum. Here the original would have been perfectly good as it stood. 'He is arriv'de' is a very commonplace phrase indeed; and as it is it is tautological, for in the very first line of the scene Horatio has said 'Madame, your sonne is safe arriv'de in Denmarke'. In our previous case a line in the first stratum suggested the wording of an insertion, but it was an insertion absolutely necessary to the sense of the scene. Here that is not the case. Nor can the reviser be interpolating a phrase from the full play omitted by the constructor of the first stratum for no such phrase is found in the 'good' texts.

As it stands in Q1 'He is arriv'de' is a bald statement of fact: it is a 'principal' clause. It is separated from the previous line by the colon after 'court'. I should like to suggest the possibility that it was originally intended to be a 'noun' clause, and that the sense of the passage was 'I think that by this



time the news that he has arrived has reached the court'. The only objection to this interpretation is provided by the punctuation:

I thinke by this the news be come to court:  
He is arriv'de, etc.

But the line immediately preceding ends also with a colon:

Madam, neuer make doubt of that:  
I thinke by this the news be come to court:  
He is arriv'de, etc.

One of the commonest types of printing-house corruption is the setting up of, for example, the initial word of a line both in its proper place and also at the beginning of the next line. The compositor's eye catches the same thing twice. It seems to me that we have here to deal with a case in which the printer carelessly set up the colon which rightly occurs after 'court' both there and at the end of the following line. In that case the original would have been:

Madam, neuer make doubt of that:  
I thinke by this the news be come to court  
He is arriv'de, etc.

Such a hypothesis is bibliographically very possible; if it be accepted the tautology is done away with, for one can state at one point 'Your son has arrived', and refer at another to 'the news that he has arrived'. The statement is not directly made twice. Further, if our conclusion be accepted, 'He is arriv'de' cannot be an interpolation, as it is needed to complete the sense of the previous line.

According to the printed text Horatio exhorts the Queen to observe her husband and says that if she does she will discover that his plans for getting rid of Hamlet have miscarried, that

'things fell not to his minde'. His minde can only be Claudius' mind, and the phrase can only refer to the projected outcome of the expedition to England. It is the king's treacherous plan for Hamlet's death and the latter's circumvention of it and escape from danger which forms the subject of the scene. Things have fallen very much to Hamlet's mind!

Why should Horatio tell Gertrude that by such observation she will discover that Claudius' plan has gone awry when he has just told her that fact? He has explicitly informed her that Hamlet had been 'betray'd to death' in the king's 'packet', and that he has 'escap't the danger/ And subtle treason that the king had plotted', that he is 'safe arriv'de in Denmarke'. The Queen has already commented on these facts: she knows that the king's plan has failed. Why then tell her that if she observes the king's conduct she will discover what in fact she already knows? A fervent defender of Q1 as it is might say that Horatio means that she will find out for herself at first hand what she is here merely told - a subtle argument. He could be met with the equally subtle argument that this would imply the absence of complete trust in the only bosom friend her son has: in Q1 Hamlet, Horatio and Gertrude are lined up against the king's party more clearly than in any other text, and in this scene the Queen accepts Horatio's statements implicitly. Surely the whole point of the passage is that, the news of Hamlet's return having reached the court, the king is very soon going to suffer the shock of realising that his desperate plan for self-preservation has gone wrong and that he is

once more in a position of danger. It is the fact that in all probability already 'the news be come to court/ He is arriv'de' that is going to make Claudius 'quickly finde,/Hamlet being here, things fell not to his minde'. The two parts of the passage are related as cause and effect. And this conjecture receives support from Der Bestrafte Brudermord where, in Act V scene ii (Cohn, Shakespeare in Germany, p. 295), Hamlet says "Meine Ankurft aber wird dem Könige nicht angenehm sein".

If this be accepted (and the opening of the next scene corroborates our impression, with the king's thunderstruck "Hamlet from England! is it possible?") then a presentable hypothetical reading for the original stratum of the text might be made thus:

I thinke by this the news be come to court  
He is arriv'de, the king shall quickely finde,  
Hamlet being here, things fell not to his minde.

In that case the interpolator would have inserted 'obserue' before 'the king', and 'and you' after. But once again why should he go to the trouble of doing this? As it stood on this hypothesis the text read perfectly intelligibly and grammatically. No motive for making this extremely curious type of double interpolation is discoverable. We found a reason in our other case, and I believe that this case will be found to be analogous.

It is fairly safe to assume that the interpolation was a single connected phrase, and as it cannot have been 'He is 'arriv'de it must have been 'obserue the king'. If so, and if our reconstruction of the original sense of the passage is correct, the text must originally have read he, and not you, as the subject of the verb 'shall finde'. The complete original would have been:

I thinke by this the news be come to court  
 He is arriv'de, and he shall quickly finde,  
 Hamlet being here, things fell not to his minde.

This I believe to have been the reading of the first stratum in the 'copy'; and corroboration can be found in the text itself.

The sequence of pronouns is extremely bad. The first he refers to Hamlet: the second he, and the his, to the king. But we are not trying to furnish the best possible version for the first stratum, but to establish one which exhibits characteristics of undoubted portions of the same stratum. The first 17 and the last 10 lines of this scene are such undoubted portions inasmuch as their absolutely correct lineation in the Quarto shows that as far as they were concerned the 'copy' had not been subsequently tampered with. Take therefore a passage from each:

(Hor.)

He will relate the circumstance at full.

Queene Then I perceive there's treason in his looks  
 That seem'd to sugar o're his villanie:  
 But I will soothe and please him for a time,  
 For murderous mindes are alwayes jealous,  
 But know you not Horatio where he is?

Hor. Yes Madame, and he hath appoynted me  
 To meete him etc.

Here too the sequence of pronouns is objectionable, though the meaning is quite clear. Hamlet will relate the circumstance; there's treason in Claudius' looks; this seemed to sugar over Claudius' villany: the queen will soothe Claudius for a time; does Horatio not know where Hamlet is? Yes, and Hamlet has made an appointment; and so on. The defender of the Q1 text as it is might argue, again subtly, that there is great dramatic point in making the Queen burst out with an excited



remark about the king without naming him; she has probably been reflecting on her attitude to him (especially after the Bedroom-scene) and is strongly affected by this definite revelation of his treachery: it is her inmost thoughts she is expressing in her first four lines: she only speaks to Horatio at her fifth line, and there she takes up his last he and herself uses that pronoun to refer to the person he had been referring to. Thus, omitting her own private utterances, we would get the sequence:

(Hor.) He will relate the circumstance at full.  
 Queene But know you not Horatio where he is?

Indeed her 'but' might even be interpreted as recalling herself to her surroundings and applying herself to the matter in hand. Apart from the fact that this is far too subtle a defence for a text which can be shown in other respects to be a 'bad' one, there is evidence against it in the punctuation of the passage. For if the first four lines of her speech were in the nature of an aside, there would be a heavier punctuation-mark at the end of the fourth: then if the punctuation were 'dramatic' that would indicate the longer pause and the change of subject. As it is, there is only a comma at the end of the line. Now if the punctuation were to be regarded as of the 'light' variety that might be sufficient to indicate the pause. But there is a pause of the same length at the end of the previous line, and there is actually a colon at the end of her second line in the middle of her remarks about Claudius. Thus, both as concerns the eye of the reader and the delivery by the actor, the punctua-

tion of the Queen's first speech is unsatisfactory and forbids us to interpret her first four lines as an aside. After a long pause at 'villanie' there follows a line with a short pause at the end: that is followed by the last line of the so-called aside which has at the end the same short pause, so that the succeeding line follows it after exactly the same short interval as it had followed its predecessor. If the punctuation is not 'dramatic' but grammatical, it is equally absurd; a change of subject at the fifth line of the speech would require at least a semi-colon at the end of the fourth, especially as there is a colon at the end of a preceding line within the speech. Whatever way we regard the punctuation the sequence of pronouns cannot be defended; the comma at the end of the Queen's fourth line, taken in conjunction with the comma at the end of her third, binds the last three lines together with pauses of equal length at the end of each. So there is no greater break between the fourth and fifth lines of the speech than between the third and the fourth. The pronominal transition is thus extremely awkward:

But I will soothe and please him for a time,  
 For murderous mindes are alwayes jealous,<sup>1</sup>  
 But know you not Horatio where he is?

Again towards the end of the scene we have:

Queene But what became of Gilderstone and Rossencraft?

---

1. What would be needed if this were the end of an aside would be some heavy mark of punctuation which would correspond to our dash.

Hor. He being set ashore, they went for England,  
And in the packet there writ down that doome  
To be performed on them poynted for him:

He at the beginning of Horatio's speech is Hamlet: but the last pronoun ('his minde') referred to the king. This he, therefore, leaps over the his and refers to 'Hamlet' which occurs in the phrase 'Hamlet being here'. Similarly, the unexpressed subject of the verb writ is not the immediately preceding pronoun they, but, leaping over that, the preceding he.

In two cases, therefore, one from the undisturbed first 17 lines, the other from the undisturbed last 10 lines, both passages being of the first stratum untouched by a disarranging interpolator, we find as a characteristic feature an extremely awkward use of pronouns. In our reconstruction of this stratum at another point we were led to adopt a version where misuse of personal pronouns was likewise a characteristic. The two undoubted cases corroborate the hypothetical one, and the reading we have reconstructed accords with undoubted characteristics of the stratum we are trying to restore.

I hold therefore that the original stratum read as follows:

I thinke by this the news be come to court  
He is arriv'de, and he shall quickly finde,  
Hamlet being here, things fell not to his minde.

and that the reviser inserted 'obserue the king' (an interpolation) and changed he to you (an emendation).

If it be said that this hypothetical original is far worse than the other examples cited of the awkward use of pronouns, I should agree, and go on to say that this extreme badness was

precisely the reason for the interpolator's interference. In the case of the previous interpolation in this scene we found a motive for its being made: here there is an equally good motive. Some faults the reviser could pass, but hardly such bad ones as this. Just as we rejected two possible conjectures of original readings here on the ground that they would be so good as to present no reason for a reviser's tinkering, so we can accept the present one because it gives an excellent reason for such tinkering. Our reconstruction has therefore these two merits: (a) it exemplifies a characteristic structural defect found in other portions of the same stratum of text, and (b) that defect presents a motive for alteration to the editing reviser. No other hypothetical reading for the original can be found which will fulfill these conditions.

Once again, as in our previous case, we can detect the sources of the wording of this interpolation. The second agent in the construction of the 'copy' for Q1 thought that the first had made a blunder. But in his alterations he did not take into account the full context of the offending passage. Instead of realising that the point was that owing to the arrival at court of the news of Hamlet's return the king was very quickly going to discover that his plans had fallen through, he thought that it should be the Queen who should make that discovery by observation of the king's behaviour on receipt of the message. As we have seen this produces inconsistency in the scene, but it is what the reviser thought it should be. Now there is an



exactly similar situation to this at a previous, very important, point in the play. The whole object of the planning of the play-scene is that Hamlet and Horatio, by observing the king's reaction, will discover his guilt concerning the successful murder of the late king. Here the Queen, likewise by observing the king's conduct, is to discover his guilt concerning the projected murder of Hamlet himself. Moreover, at two previous points in the full play we find phraseology which echoes irresistably our 'obserue the king'; and both occur in connection with the planning of the play-scene.

At Act II scene ii lines 598 seq. in the 'good' texts we have:

I'll have these players  
Play something like the murder of my father  
Before mine uncle, I'll obserue his looks,  
I'll tent him to the quick, if a' do blench  
I know my course.

And at Act III scene ii lines 73 seq. occurs this:

There is a play tonight before the king,  
One scene of it comes near the circumstance  
Which I have told thee of my father's death.  
I prithee when thou seest that act afoot,  
Even with the very comment of thy soul  
Observe my uncle- if his occulted guilt  
Do not itself unkennel, etc.

In the first passage Hamlet is telling Himself to do what in the second he is telling Horatio to do. The words run exactly parallel: thus

II ii 598 ff.

I'll have these players play  
.....before mine uncle.

something like the murder of  
my father.

III ii 73 ff.

There is a play tonight before  
the king.

One scene of it comes near the  
circumstance / Which I have told  
thee of my father's death.

I'll observe his looks, I'll      I prithee when thou seest that  
 tent him to the quick.              act afoot.....observe my uncle.

Such parallel phraseology used in connection with the same dramatic situation would easily become confused in a piratical mind. In particular we notice that Hamlet has two ways of referring to Claudius, as 'the king' and as 'my (or mine) uncle'. These are used practically synonymously; any subtle difference that a sensitive literary critic might detect would be quite lost upon a pirate relying on his memory alone. Within the later of these two passages there is the variation 'before the king' and 'observe my uncle'. Between the two passages there is the variation 'before mine uncle' and 'before the king', and the identical initial word would, as we know from other examples, be sufficient to cause a confusion between the two phrases in a pirate's mind. In both passages the word 'observe' occurs. In the latter the phrase is 'observe my uncle'. In view of the probable confusion between the two passages, and particularly the confusion between 'the king' and 'my uncle', this could with the greatest of ease become in the pirate's mind 'observe the king'. This seems quite obviously the memorial source of that phrase in our interpolation in Q1 scene 14, where as we have seen the reviser was presenting a similar dramatic situation.

We saw in examining the other interpolation in the scene that part of its phrasing was suggested by a piece of the original stratum itself. I believe that this occurred here also. The Queen's first words in this Q1 scene were:

Then I perceive there's treason in his lookes, etc.

I suggest that this was enough to remind the reviser of the play-scene situation where the king's looks were all-important, and to suggest to him that below in the same scene in the manuscript he was revising a similar situation to that, turning on observation of Claudius' looks should have been delineated. In particular we remember the phrase 'I'll observe his looks' at II ii 598 ff. "His Lookes" in the scene before him reminded the interpolator of the play-scene and its planning: memorial association led him back to a conflated recollection of two closely parallel passages connected with that planning: his looks occurred in one of these, closely connected with the word observe; he was led on to observe my uncle in the other, but because of the fusion it came out as observe the king: and that was what he inserted in this scene. He altered the he of the first stratum to you because that was the seat of the unsatisfactoriness of the original reading, and because in the previous passage between Hamlet and Horatio which he was remembering in conjunction with another related passage Hamlet had been saying in effect: 'Observe Claudius, and you will discover so-and-so'. Once the insertion had been made, the emendation had to follow to make the sense of the passage complete and intelligible as the reviser understood it.

This interpolation therefore comes from a memorial conflation of three passages with distinct connections of situation and phrase: (a) a line earlier in the same Q1 scene containing a reference to Claudius' lookes, (b) two passages in the full

play (II ii 598 ff. and III ii 73 ff.). That these two latter passages were susceptible of confusion in a piratical mind is conclusively proved by the Q1 version of Hamlet's instructions to Horatio just before the play-scene. He says:

When thou shalt see that Act afoote,  
Marke thou the King, doe but obserue his lookes, etc.

As we have seen, in the corresponding passage in the 'good' texts Hamlet says (III ii 76-78):

I prithee when thou seest that act afoot,  
Even with the very comment of thy soul  
Observe my uncle.....

whereas it is in the earlier passage, in the Hecuba soliloquy, that he says (II ii 600):

I'll observe his looks.

We are only at the moment concerned to show that that confusion could be, and actually was, made: it does not matter at the moment whether it was the constructor of the original stratum of the text or the interpolator. It is a confusion likely to be made by anyone working from memory alone.

There is more to be said concerning Q1 scene 14: but we can leave it for the time being, summing up our conclusions so far:

- (a) In the scene there are two distinct levels of text: the first, comprising the bulk of the scene, was written in regular scannable verse. Its writer was prone to leave inconsistency in his text, and also to use personal pronouns badly. The second consists of two small interpolations one of which includes a small emendation; these, made without care for metrical



regularity, and in a confined space in the manuscript, disturbed the lineation in the 'copy' for Q1, so that the compositor following that 'copy' set it up in the irregular form found in the Quarto.

(b) The two interpolations present complete similarity in motive and method:

1. Both were made to cover up a glaring error in the original stratum, in the one case an inconsistency and in the other a grammatical howler.
2. Both were made by memory only, and without the help of any authentic manuscript to make corrections by.
3. The phrasing of both was partially suggested by words in other parts of the first stratum in the same scene.
4. Both were made with flexible memorial association with a plurality of other passages of similar situation and wording in previous portions of the play.

This detailed similarity means that each case tends to corroborate the other.



inserted the words "and lifted up his head to motion," and in the margin, immediately before the words "but euen then...." he inserted "like as he would speake". Similarly, the fourth lines of our hypothetically reconstructed first-stratum version corresponds to Shakespeare's

And at the sound it shrunk in haste away  
And vanished our sight.

The writer of the Q1 first stratum omitted "shrunk....away" and "and at the sound"; he reproduced "in haste" as "in all haste". The interpolator remembered the full phrase "it shrunk in haste away"; I believe that between the third and fourth lines of the passage suggested for the first stratum he inserted the words "shruncke in haste away, and", indicating that these were to appear between the words "it" and "vanished". He failed to notice the absurd tautologies that resulted from these insertions. After he had worked on it, the Q1 'copy' may have looked something like the diagram opposite, where ink represents the first and pencil the second stratum.

After setting up the line "Yet once me thought it was aboute to speake", the Q1 compositor proceeded to set up the line which had been inserted immediately after it ("And lifted up his head to motion,"). Then, owing to the fact that the words "like as he would speake" had been inserted in the margin, he found himself faced with what looked one large line, viz. "Like as he would speake but euen then the morning cocke crew lowd,". But this was far too long to set as a single line. So in all probability

## III.

SCENE 6.

During the planning of the meeting between Ophelia and Hamlet (the "Nunnery" episode) in this scene, the following passage occurs in Q1:

(Cor.)

And if this be not true, take this from this.

King Thinke you t'is so?

Cor. How? so my Lord, I would very faine know  
That thing that I haue saide t'is so, positiuely,  
And it hath fallen out otherwise.  
Nay, if circumstances leade me on,  
Ile finde it out, if it were hid  
As deepe as the centre of the earth.

King how should wee trie this same?

Cor. Mary my good lord thus,  
The Princes walke is here in the galery, etc.

The bulk of scene 6 - even including Corambis's speeches - is, despite metrical crudities and the frequency of extra short syllables, written in tolerably regular verse. The six-line speech of Corambis quoted here is metrically very irregular. Two other details stand out, namely, (a) the small letter at the beginning of the line 'how should wee trie this same?', and (b) the question-mark after Corambis's 'How' in the phrase 'How? so my Lord'.

There can be no doubt that after the King has said, presumably in a hesitant manner, 'Thinke you t'is so?' Corambis's quick rejoinder is meant to run 'How so, my Lord, I would very faine know etc.' If a question-mark were used, the punctuation would be "How so, my Lord? - I would very faine know..." The



emphasis is on the word so: Corambis is confident of his diagnosis, and indignant that it should be for a moment doubted. But whatever interpretation we place on the line it is clear that the Q1 punctuation as it stands is faulty. And before we hastily assume that the compositor from pure negligence misplaced the question-mark in this most extraordinary manner we must consider that the coincidence of three separate irregularities within seven lines (a grossly misplaced punctuation-mark: an irregular <sup>initial</sup> small letter in a line: and very faulty metre in a generally metrical scene) may point to some sort of irregularity in the 'copy' itself.

I suggest that we have to do with composite 'copy' and that the original stratum read:

And if this be not true, take this from this.  
King Thinke you t'is so? how should wee trie this same?  
Cor. How? Mary my good Lord thus,  
 The Princes walke is here in the galery,  
 etc.

This is perfectly metrical: for an ejaculation like 'How?' can in delivery be followed by a silence equal to the missing feet in the line, and the regular pentameter can be made up of sounds and 'rests' (in musical parlance). In any case, the exclamation following the king's question, along with the few words introductory to the enunciation of the plan in reply to it, could easily be regarded as being extra metrum in any sort of text, 'good' or 'bad'.

There is excellent point to the single exclamation 'How?' in this hypothetical original stratum. The king asks how they

should test the matter: 'How?' asks Corambis - the matter will be simplicity's self. Then he outlines the project. The 'How?' is a rejoinder not to the immediately preceding question in the printed quarto, but to the king's second question which in the quarto comes several lines later owing to the disarrangement in the manuscript used as 'copy'.

I suggest that after the interpolator had worked on the passage, the 'copy' looked something like the diagram opposite: the ink represents the original stratum, the pencil the interpolator's contribution.

In the interpolator's final version no question-mark is really needed; it would be quite characteristic of the punctuation of the first quarto to read:

How so my Lord, I would very faine know, etc.  
 And this is probably what the interpolator meant to have. But in changing the original simple 'How?' into the connected phrase 'How so' he omitted to cancel the original question-mark, or at any rate to cancel it clearly enough. His careful patching up of the sequence by indicating the transference of the position of Claudius' second question required the compositor's full attention; the space was in all probability confined and crowded. The compositor reproduced the transference properly, but he was watching the copy so closely that he failed to realise quite fully that the second question was now to begin a line: as he actually saw it in the copy itself it provided the latter half of a line. In straining to reproduce the difficult

alterations he momentarily forgot the capital he would normally have supplied.

This last point is perhaps tenuous, but it does not matter. The irregular query-mark and the metrical and linear confusion would themselves warrant the adoption of the interpolation theory. The 'How?' reads so extraordinarily naturally in our hypothetical reconstruction of the original stratum that we may consider it in the last resort sufficiently likely. And the metre clinches the matter; for the writer of the first stratum is so very anxious to have metrical regularity at all costs that he could produce a few lines above

She as my childe obediently obeyed me.

And that is in another speech by Corambis, so we cannot argue that his speeches were intended to be metrically looser.

Once again the interpolator was supplying an omission. The whole passage runs thus in the full play (II ii 151 ff.):

<u>King</u>	Do you think 'tis this?
<u>Queen</u>	It may be, very like.
<u>Pol.</u>	Hath there been such a time, I would fain know that, That I have positively said "'Tis so", When it proved otherwise?
<u>King</u>	Not that I know.
<u>Pol.</u>	Take this from this, if this be otherwise; If circumstances lead me, I will find Where truth is hid, though it were hid indeed Within the Centre.
<u>King</u>	How may we try it further? etc.

Now the writer of the original stratum of the copy for Q1 remembers and uses some of this material. He produces 'And if this be not true, take this from this', and places it at the end of Corambis's previous long speech. It is a perfectly metrical

line. On either side of the corresponding line in the 'good' texts there lies a passage which he omitted. The reviser inserted much of this, but quite unmetrically: the two hands use entirely different techniques. Further, the actual words "'tis so" occur in the 'good' texts only in a passage omitted by the first hand in Q1; but the writer of the first stratum remembered them, and substituted them in his version for the King's

Do you think 'tis this?

These two elements from the omitted passage, present in the first stratum of the Q1 copy, may easily have reminded the reviser of the whole passage and impelled him to insert as much of it as he could.

A few lines before the passage we have been considering, Q1 has this:

Thine euer the most vnhappy Prince Hamlet.

My Lord, what doe you thinke of me?

I? or what might you thinke when I sawe this?

King As of a true friend and a most louing subject.

Cor. I would be glad to prooue so.

Now when I saw this letter, thus I bespake my maiden:  
etc.

Of the two successive questions asked by Corambis, the king answers only the first; the second is disregarded. That the latter is a rhetorical question does not diminish the extreme awkwardness of the sequence. The king's answer is closely bound to the first question by its corresponding structure just as in the 'good' texts, where there is no interruption:

Pol.

What do you think of me?

King

As of a man faithful and honourable.



The most natural sequence in Q1 would be:

My Lord, what doe you thinke of me?

King As of a true friend and a most louing subject.

Cor. I would be glad to prooue so.

Now when I sawe this letter,.....

and this I hold to have been the reading of the original stratum of the 'copy'. The sequence is good, and each element is bound up with what precedes it; the one matter is dealt with, and when it is finished the speaker goes on to the next in an orderly fashion.

The reviser remembered the series of rhetorical questions 'What might you think?' in the corresponding speech in the full play (II ii 130 ff.). It is repeated three times. The first occurrence is that which corresponds to the Q1 interpolation.

It runs:

But what might you think  
When I had seen this hot love on the wing  
 As I perceived it (I must tell you that)  
 Before my daughter told me?

The Q1 line:

I, or what might you thinke when I sawe this?  
 means, of course, 'when I saw this letter'. A phrase is lifted from the full version of the play, but its application completely changed.

The original stratum had 'Now when I saw this letter' very near this point, as we have seen. I suggest that the interpolator read it and that it reminded him of the above-quoted passage in the final play, omitted by the first hand. And it affected his reconstruction of the omission. His recollection of the passage in the full play was very vague and general; he

took a hint from the actual wording of this other portion of the first stratum of the copy for Q1; it affected the wording of his interpolation, and even the meaning. So the insertion is a sort of involuntary conflation of (a) a phrase in the original stratum ('Now when I saw this letter'), and (b) a dim memory of the passage in the full play -

But what might you think  
When I had seen this hot love on the wing,

This is not the first interpolation we have seen where the wording was suggested by a phrase in the first stratum, combined with a dim recollection of another passage. Where more than one case is found with the same method of execution each to some extent authenticates the other. I feel that in the present case we should regard the Q1 line

I, or what mighte you thinke when I sawe this?  
as an interpolation. The least the reviser could do was to attempt to fit it in with the connecting link 'I, or'. We may also note that, in addition to what we have already said, the reviser's memory of the rhetorical 'What might you think' in the 'good' texts was itself probably prompted by the first question 'what doe you thinke of me?' which likewise stood in the original manuscript he was editing. Thus, both

My Lord, what doe you thinke of me?  
and

Now when I saw this letter,  
in the first stratum itself, played their part in producing the interpolation.

I would suggest another case of composite 'copy' in scene

6. In the passage:

Yea mary may it; for Beauty may transforme  
Honesty, from what she was into a bawd:  
Then Honesty can transforme Beauty:  
This was sometimes a Paradox, etc.

there are two suspicious circumstances. Firstly, there is no word to which 'Then' (i.e. 'than') can point back. The 'good' texts have the construction 'sooner.....than'. Secondly, though the third line of the extract is closely connected with the second it is heavily marked off from it by the colon after 'bawd'. This gravely disturbs the continuity of the passage. I believe that the original stratum of the 'copy' contained only -

Yea mary may it; for Beauty may transforme  
Honesty, from what she was into a bawd:  
This was sometimes a Paradox, etc.

Here the colon is admirably justified. But the 'paradox' is incomplete. The reviser completed it as far as he could remember it, but omitted to insert the necessary link in some word corresponding to the 'good' texts' "sooner". He placed a colon after his short insertion. As in other examples already dealt with, the wording of the interpolation was partially suggested by the context in the original MS which was being edited. For while the good versions have

than the force of honesty can translate beauty to  
his likeness

the Q1 interpolation repeats the transforme of the previous remark, which had been set down in the original stratum of the MS.

At the same time, the form 'can transforme' in the interpolation reproduces the 'can translate' of the good texts, whereas the previous remark in the first stratum had had 'may transforme' (corresponding to the good texts' "will.....transform"). So part of the phrasing of the insertion is accurately taken from the corresponding passage in the good texts, while part of it was suggested by the first stratum of the copy itself. This is analogous, for example, to the Q1 line "And bid him ply his musicke" in scene 5, where musicke comes from the corresponding line in the full version of the play, while bid (instead of the good versions' "let") comes from the line 'And bid him ply his learning' which stood in the original stratum of the copy for Q1. This was pointed out by Dr H. de Groot in a letter to the Times Literary Supplement (March 8, 1923).



## IV.

THE PLAY-SCENE.

As soon as the Court has assembled for the play (Q1 scene 9) the following conversation takes place between Hamlet and the King:

(a play?)

King How now son Hamlet, how fare you, shall we haue  
Ham. Yfaith the Camelions dish, not capon-cramm'd,  
 feede a the ayre.  
 I father: My lord, etc. (to Corambis).

The person responsible for reporting the quibble here has understood it only partially. He realises that the chameleon's dish is the air, but he does not remember that Hamlet refers to the King's empty promises; he feeds on the air 'promise-crammed'. A faint recollection of this phrase and of the remark 'You cannot feed capons so' is responsible for the inept conflation here in 'not capon-cramm'd'. The writer fails to grasp that Hamlet talks of himself as the capon which the king should be fattening against its destruction. That such a many-sided quibble should be but imperfectly grasped by a memorial reconstructor is quite believable; continually throughout the first quarto we come across the failure to see the point of a quibble or joke.

Here, however, despite these misunderstandings, the genesis of the quibble is fully appreciated. It lies in the King's use of the polite formula 'How fare you', Hamlet purposely taking it as a reference to food. The beginning of the play-scene

proper runs in the 'good' texts:

King How fares our cousin Hamlet?

Ham. Excellent i'faith, of the chameleon's dish, I eat  
the air, promise-crammed - you cannot feed capons so.

Several phenomena call for comment in the Q1 opening.

The king gives a double greeting, not a single one as in the good texts: he says (1) How now son Hamlet (2) How fare you. The double use of 'how' is awkward; but there are other things more awkward. In Q1 the King asks two distinct questions, one immediately after the other: (1) How fare you? (2) Shall we have a play? Hamlet answers them in order, the first first. His 'ay, father' answers the second question; but the arrangement is extraordinarily clumsy. After the elaborate quibble, which would fully occupy an audience's or reader's attention, he baldly says 'ay, father', by which time the question he was answering is in all probability forgotten. Moreover, the quibble itself is separated from the question which gave rise to it by the other question; so that the point of Hamlet's complex remark following on the king's fare is much blunted. Each reply is clumsily separated from the question which it answers.

It might be held that the rapidity of the elocution or of the reader's eye would largely discount these separations. But suspicions on general impressionistic grounds are borne out by clear bibliographical evidence suggesting that here the text is not simple but composite. The reply 'I father' begins right at the margin: the quibble ends with 'feede a the ayre' which fills only a small space in the line preceding. The whole passage

appears to be prose: why therefore does the 'I father' not follow in the same line as 'feede a the ayre'?

I suggest that by looking at the text as it is printed in the quarto we can come to no other conclusion but that the whole quibble is an interpolation made in an original version. Further, I hold that the phrase 'how fare you' was interpolated in the first line at the same time. The original stratum of the 'copy' ran:

King How now son Hamlet, shall we have a play?  
Ham. I father: etc.

The reviser remembered the quibble and the words that gave rise to it. If the lines were written in the original stratum of the manuscript in such a way that there was sufficient space between them to write two lines in, the Q1 arrangement would be satisfactorily accounted for. The interpolator would put his insertion in between these two lines: it was a little too long to get in in one line, so he continued it to begin another, only putting four words into this other. He probably inserted the 'how fare you' above the first line, between that and the stage-direction, with a mark to show where it was to be fitted into that line. The complete copy would look something like the diagram opposite: the ink indicates the original stratum and the pencil the additions.

If we are right in regarding 'how fare you' as an interpolation, we notice that the line originally in the 'copy' was a regular pentameter. This helps our case in view of the fact that in investigating scene 14 we saw that the writer of the first

stratum of the 'copy' favoured metrically regular blank verse. It does not follow that he always did this; but where for other reasons we abstract a phrase from a line, regarding it as a subsequent insertion, and find that the remainder forms a metrical line, we are entitled to regard that as to some extent confirmation of our analysis: for again in reconstructing the first stratum we take account of characteristics of other undoubted portions of that stratum.

I suggest, then, that if we accept as interpolations the words 'how fare you' and the imperfect reproduction of the quibble we have explained (1) the awkward separation of both sets of answers from the corresponding questions (2) the fact that 'I father:' begins at the margin although the previous line contains only four words. Originally there was only one question - 'shall we have a play?' - and it was answered straight away as we should expect.

In the original stratum the 'How fares our cousin Hamlet?' of the 'good' texts had been represented by 'How now son Hamlet': the interpolator remembered the quibble and the mode of its introduction: he therefore inserted a phrase more nearly resembling 'How fares our cousin.....'. The repetition of the 'how' in the Q1 line is due to both agencies at work in a composite text attempting to represent the same phrase: the second is more accurate than the first. And the motive for the insertion lay in the fact that the first hand had omitted a difficult and complex remark of Hamlet's which the reviser remembered, though



stratum of the 'copy' favoured metrically regular blank verse. It does not follow that he always did this; but where for other reasons we abstract a phrase from a line, regarding it as a subsequent insertion, and find that the remainder forms a metrical line, we are entitled to regard that as to some extent confirmation of our analysis: for again in reconstructing the first stratum we take account of characteristics of other undoubted portions of that stratum.

I suggest, then, that if we accept as interpolations the words 'how fare you' and the imperfect reproduction of the quibble we have explained (1) the awkward separation of both sets of answers from the corresponding questions (2) the fact that 'I father:' begins at the margin although the previous line contains only four words. Originally there was only one question - 'shall we have a play?' - and it was answered straight away as we should expect.

In the original stratum the 'How fares our cousin Hamlet?' of the 'good' texts had been represented by 'How now son Hamlet': the interpolator remembered the quibble and the mode of its introduction: he therefore inserted a phrase more nearly resembling 'How fares our cousin.....'. The repetition of the 'how' in the Q1 line is due to both agencies at work in a composite text attempting to represent the same phrase: the second is more accurate than the first. And the motive for the insertion lay in the fact that the first hand had omitted a difficult and complex remark of Hamlet's which the reviser remembered, though

imperfectly. He was consciously supplying an omission.

A little further on in the same scene we come upon a similar problem. Q1 reads:

Ofel. What meanes this my Lord? Enter the Prologue.

Ham. This is myching Mallico, that meanes my chiefe.

Ofel. What doth this meane my lord?

Ham. you shall heare anone, this fellow will tell you all.

Apart from the double question which undoubtedly rouses suspicion, it is noticeable that the speaker of the Prologue enters two and a half lines before he is even referred to by Hamlet, and over half a dozen lines before he speaks. In the Folio he enters immediately before his three short lines of introduction to the Gonzago play. That this is a subsequent and clumsy rearrangement is shown by the only partial readjustment of the preceding dialogue in that text:

F1:

Ophe. What meanes this, my Lord?

Ham. Marry this is Miching Malicho, that meanes Mischeefe.

Ophe. Belike this shew imports the Argument of the Play?

Ham. We shall know by these Fellowes: the Players cannot keepe counsell, they'll tell all.

Ophe. Will they tell vs what this shew meant?

Ham. I, or any shew that you'll shew him. Bee not you asham'd to shew, hee'll not shame to tell you what it meanes.

Ophe. You are naught, you are naught, Ile marke the Play

Enter Prologue

For us, and for our Tragedie, etc.

Undoubtedly the correct arrangement is that of Q2:

Oph. VVhat meanes this my Lord?

Ham. Marry this munching Mallico, it meanes mischief.

Oph. Belike this show imports the argument of the play.

Ham. We shall know by this fellow, Enter Prologue.  
The Players cannot keepe, they'le tell all.

The Prologue enters just before Hamlet refers to him: the stage-direction presumably follows after 'argument of the play' and comes before "We shall know....".

His entry in Q1 two and a half lines before he is talked of might not, taken by itself, trouble us: the two and a half lines would take a very short time to speak, and he would not be standing idle very long. But the repetition of Ophelia's question suggests a definite conclusion. If for the moment we cut out the material between the two identical questions, including the second question itself, we get the following:

Ofel. What meanes this my Lord: Enter the Prologue.

Ham. you shall heare anone, this fellow will tell you all.

where, as in Q2, the Prologue enters just in time to be referred to by Hamlet. I suggest that this was the reading of the original stratum. The lines

Ham. This is myching Mallico, that meanes my chiefe.

Ofel. What doth this meane my lord?

are a subsequent interpolation. As in the last case we discussed, the original constructor of the Q1 text has omitted one of Hamlet's difficult remarks, and the reviser has inserted it. Having done so, the latter had to repeat Ophelia's question in order to make the sequence intelligible. But when he did so, he was influenced by a recollection of a passage in one of the Ghost-scenes at the beginning of the play. Whereas in the original stratum Ophelia asks "What meanes this" (as in the 'good' texts, III ii 134), the reviser makes her ask "What doth

this meane my lord?" These identical words are found in the 'good' texts at I iv 7. We shall later find that several reminiscences of the Ghost-scenes occur in the later portions of Q1.



## V.

THE SCENE IN THE GRAVE-YARD.

In the Q1 version of this scene there seems to be at least one clear example of the reviser's handiwork. It occurs in Hamlet's speech to Laertes, after the funeral procession has appeared:

- 1 I prethee take thy hand from off my throate,  
For there is something in me dangerous,  
Which let thy wisdom feare, holde off thy hand:  
I lou'de Ofelia as deere as twenty brothers could:
- 5 Shew me what thou wilt doe for her;  
Wilt fight, wilt fast, wilt pray,  
Wilt drinke vp vessels, eate a crocadile? Ile doot:  
Com'st thou here to whine?  
And where thou talk'st of burying thee a liue,
- 10 Here let vs stand: and let them throw on vs,  
Whole hills of earth, till with the heighth thereof,  
Make Oosell as a Wart.

In this passage lines 1-3 and lines 9-12 are metrically regular: lines 4-8 are un-metrical. Moreover as the passage stands the sequence is awkward, especially the transition from line 8 to line 9: the initial 'And' of the latter seems out of place. Metre and sequence alike demand the following reconstruction of the passage which stood in the original stratum of the 'copy':

I prethee take thy hand from off my throate,  
For there is something in me dangerous,  
Which let thy wisdom feare, holde off thy hand;  
And where thou talk'st of burying thee a liue,  
Here let vs stand: and let them throw on vs,  
Whole hills of earth, till with the heighth thereof,  
Make Oosell as a Wart.

Both metre and sequence are here perfect: the passage reads easily and naturally. So anxious is its writer to make it

metrically regular that he omits the they necessary as the subject of the verb make. This agrees with the character we have discovered for the original stratum of the 'copy' at other places: grammar gives way to metre.

This seems to me one of the clearest cases of composite copy which we have come across in Q1. Where a patently unmetrical passage occurs in the middle of an otherwise metrical speech, and where by removing it we get a sequence very much better than that of the quarto as it is, we may suggest that the unmetrical portion (i.e. lines 4-8) is an interpolation. In the passage quoted we seem to be faced with two distinct kinds of writing.

## VI.

Scene 11.

Let us glance at the Q1 text of the speech which corresponds to IV i 7-12 of the 'good' texts. The Queen is describing Hamlet's behaviour in the bedroom-scene. The King asks her, according to Q1, "how doe you / finde him? Her reply is as follows:

Alas my lord, as raging as the sea:  
 Whenas he came, I first bespake him faire,  
 But then he throwes and tosses me about,  
 As one forgetting that I was his mother:  
 At last I call'd for help: and as I cried, Corambis  
 Call'd, which Hamlet no sooner heard, but whips me  
 Out his rapier, and cries, a Rat, a Rat, and in his rage  
 The good olde man he killes.

King Why this his madnesse will vndoe our state etc.

The first four lines of this passage are absolutely metrical, as is the first line of the King's reply (and indeed the whole of his speech). On the other hand no metrical sense can be made of the lines which contain the reference to Hamlet's exclamation "A rat, a rat".

Now if we turn back to the point where Hamlet actually makes this exclamation we find irregular structure in Q1 there also. The passage corresponds to III iv 21 seq., and runs as follows:

Queene What wilt thou doe? thou wilt not murder me:  
 Helpe hoe.

Cor. Helpe for the Queene.

Ham. I a Rat, dead for a Duckat.

Rash intruding foole farewell,

I tooke thee for thy better.

Queene Hamlet, what hast thou done?

Here, Hamlet's three short lines disturb the metre of the whole

passage; if they are removed, satisfactory metrical and structural conditions result.

It is certainly remarkable that at both points in Q1 where the ejaculation "A rat, a rat" occurs the structure breaks down utterly. It seems to me very likely that both the irregular passages were interpolated by a reviser of the original text which stood in the Q1 'copy'. I would reconstruct the first stratum thus:

(a) The passage corresponding to III iv 21 seq.:

Queene What wilt thou doe? thou wilt not murder me:  
    Helpe hoe.  
Cor. Helpe for the Queene.  
Queene Hamlet, what hast thou done?

This is certainly rather curt and brief; but it is quite possible that the writer of the original stratum intended Hamlet to stab at the arras immediately on hearing Corambis' exclamation, and intended the Queen to ask "what hast thou done" immediately the blow was struck.

(b) The passage corresponding to IV i 7-12:

Queene Alas my lord, as raging as the sea:  
    Whenas he came, I first bespake him faire,  
    But then he throwes and tosses me about,  
    As one forgetting that I was his mother:  
    At last I call'd for help, and in his rage  
    The good olde man he killes.  
King Why this his madnesse will vndoe our state etc.

It is possible to suggest exactly how the two insertions were made in the Q1 'copy', and what that 'copy' looked like at these points. The very short lines of the earlier insertion suggest marginal insertion, whereas the long lines of the second



insertion suggest that they were perhaps written along the space at the bottom of a page in the manuscript.

In the reconstruction (a) above, the words "Helpe for....  
....thou done" form one metrical line; but the arrangement in the 'copy' was probably this:

Cor. Helpe for the Queene.  
Queene Hamlet, what hast thou done?

If so, there would be sufficient room for the interpolation in the right-hand margin; its final position could easily be indicated by an arrow.

At the second of the two composite patches of text the final state of the 'copy' was probably something like this:

*as one forgetting that I was his mother:  
at last I call'd for help; and in his rage  
and as I cried Corambis  
call'd, which Hamlet no sooner heard, but whips me  
out his rapier, and cries, a Rat, a Rat,*

(bottom of MS. page)

Top of next MS. page

*the good olde man he kills.  
King why this his madnesse will undoe our state  
etc..*

(Ink = original stratum; pencil = interpolation).

After setting up "At last I call'd for help" the compositor finished the line with "and as I cried, Corambis". He set up the first long line of the interpolation as a single line. Finally, if, after fitting in the interpolation, the compositor (returning to the original stratum) finished off the line begun

by "Out.....a Rat, a Rat", with the phrase "and in his rage" -- a phrase which finished off a line in the 'copy' -- the arrangement in the printed text would be fully accounted for.

I need hardly emphasise the conjectural nature of this reconstruction of the Q1 'copy' here; but I am persuaded that some such explanation is needed to account for the abrupt structural collapse at both points where "a rat, a rat" occurs.

SECTION 2.

THE MEMORIAL ELEMENT IN THE  
TRANSMISSION OF PASSAGES NOT INTERPOLATED.

---

I propose in this section to examine the composition of certain specimen passages in Q1 where interpolation cannot be suspected.

## I.

THE KING'S SOLILOQUY IN THE PRAYER-SCENE.

In Q1 this soliloquy comprises 13 lines, while in the 'good' texts it consists of  $36\frac{1}{2}$  lines.

One of the most notable features of the Q1 version is that the king reproaches himself not only for the murder of his brother, but also for 'the adulterous fault I haue committed': in the 'good' texts it is only 'a brother's murder' which concerns him.

Now in the Bedroom scene Hamlet accuses his mother of participation in the very crimes of which Claudius here accuses himself in Q1. A transition is quickly made from the killing of a king to the marrying with his brother, and Hamlet proceeds to make the adultery and incest the main subject of his denunciation of the Queen. If a pirate, relying only on his memory, confused the two scenes whose subjects correspond and are so similar, he might be led to make in the Prayer-scene the same transition as was made in the Bedroom-scene.

Indications that such a confusion was in fact made are given by certain verbal connections between the two scenes in Q1. In his self-reproaches in the 'good' texts Claudius refers to his 'offence', his 'guilt', and his 'fault'. At one point in the Q1 version he says:

When I looke vp to heauen, I see my trespasse.

This word does not occur in this speech in the 'good' texts.



But in the Q2 and F1 versions of the Bedroom scene Hamlet says to the Queen (III iv 144 ff.):

Mother, for love of grace,  
Lay not that flattering unction to your soul,  
That not your trespass but my madness speaks,

and, a line or two later:

Confess yourself to heaven.

Her 'trespass' was shared by Claudius; and there can be little doubt that this is the memorial source of the word in the Q1 soliloquy. It is made even surer by Claudius' final:

Aske grace of heauen....

which is a conflation of the 'good' texts' "for love of grace" and "Confess yourself to heaven", suggested in the first place by the king's resolve to pray to heaven in the soliloquy in the 'good' versions.

Again, the king says in Q1:

I, but still to perseuer in a sinne,  
It is an act.....

And this echoes words in the Q1 Bedroom-scene not found there in either Q2 or F1:

Nay but still to persist and dwell in sinne.

Furthermore, the word act, referring to the sinful association between Claudius and Gertrude, is used several times with striking effect in the full version of the Bedroom-scene.

'What have I done?' the queen asks; 'such an act.....' is the reply, and then 'this solidity and compound mass.....Is thought-sick at the act'; 'Ay me, what act?' she asks (III iv 40, 51).

The source of these two similar lines quoted from the Q1 Prayer-scene and Bedroom-scene (lines not found in the 'good' texts at either place), is very probably away back in the first act of the full play. In the Council-scene Claudius says to Hamlet (I ii 92 ff.):

But to persever  
In obstinate condolement.....  
It shows a will most incorrect to heaven,

and a few lines later:

...fie, 'tis a fault to heaven.

The word 'fault' is used in both 'good' and 'bad' versions of the soliloquy in the prayer-scene: and it is very probably the small link of association which brings together that scene and the Council-scene in Q1. Whereas 'trespasse' was probably taken into the prayer-scene soliloquy from the bedroom-scene by anticipation, the line 'Nay but still to persist and dwell in sinne' was in all likelihood taken into the Q1 bedroom-scene from the Q1 prayer-scene, where the word fault had precipitated a confusion with the much earlier Council-scene. It is from that scene that the king's words 'I, but still to perseuer' come; the idea was present in the 'good' version of the soliloquy in other words altogether:

I am still possessed  
Of those effects for which I did the murder;  
.....  
May one be pardoned and retain th'offence?

The king speaks of his 'adulterous fault'. In the Q1 Bedroom-scene Hamlet says:

O mother, if euer you did my deare father loue,  
Forbeare the adulterous bed to night.....

In the corresponding passage in the 'good' texts we have (III iv, 159, 181-2):

Good night, but go not to my uncle's bed,  
and

Qu. What shall I do?  
Ham. Not this by no means that I bid you do --  
Let the bloat king tempt you again to bed.....

The word adulterous does not occur. The Q1 bedroom-scene's 'Forbeare the adulterous bed to night' reminds us of the line 'Or in the incestuous pleasure of his bed' which is found in both 'good' and 'bad' texts in Hamlet's speech over the praying king (III iii 90): and that exact phrase is found in Q1 not only in its proper place in the prayer-scene, but also in the Bedroom-scene itself:

A, haue you eyes and can you looke on him  
That slew my father, and your deere husband,  
To liue in the incestuous pleasure of his bed?

This further indicates the confusion between the prayer-scene and the bedroom-scene in Q1.

Now the passage we quoted from the Q1 bedroom-scene a moment ago:

O mother, if euer you did my deare father loue,  
Forbeare the adulterous bed to night,

has an unmistakable connection with a passage in Act 1 of the 'good' texts. The Ghost says to Hamlet (I v 23):

If thou didst ever thy dear father love.....

And at lines 42 seq. he goes on:

Ay, that incestuous, that adulterate beast,  
 referring to Claudius. Here is the phraseological link between  
incestuous and adulterate or adulterous, and here is the source  
 of the twice-repeated adulterous of the Q1 prayer-scene and  
 bedroom-scene. The confusion with this passage in Act 1 scene 5  
 is indicated with complete certainty not only by the bedroom-  
 scene's appropriation of 'if thou didst ever thy dear father  
 love' (in slightly altered form) but by its appropriation of the  
 Ghost's words a few lines later in his colloquy with Hamlet on  
 the battlements (I v 47 ff.). There the Ghost says:

O Hamlet, what a falling off was there  
 From me whose love was of that dignity,  
 That it went hand in hand even with the vow  
 I made to her in marriage, and to decline  
 Upon a wretch.....

while in the bedroom-scene in Q1 Hamlet says to the Queen,  
 speaking of the same falling-off:

Whose heart went hand in hand even with that vow,  
 He made to you in marriage,

words which have no counterpart in the 'good' versions of the  
 Bedroom-scene. The train of association is clear: portions of  
 the reconstructed bedroom-scene are confused with the Ghost's  
 narrative about the sins of the king and queen in Act 1 scene 5:  
 and certain features of the reconstructed king's soliloquy in  
 the prayer-scene are taken from the bedroom-scene by anticipation.  
 The king's reference to his 'adulterous fault' is a complex  
 memorial conflation: his fault is mentioned in the correspond-  
 ing passage in Q2 and F1; adulterous comes from a point in I v



which has distinct connections with the Q1 bedroom-scene which we know from other evidence to have been anticipated to some extent in the Q1 prayer-scene. So we have another example of the anticipation not only of a later passage in the play but also of a confusion made between that later passage and another passage altogether.

In Q1 the king talks of 'the murder of a brother and a king' while in the 'good' texts he only says 'a brother's murder' (III iii 38) and 'brother's blood' (ibid. 44). The double appellation of the elder Hamlet may well come from a conflation of the 'brother's murder' and the bedroom-scene's 'as kill a king', especially as in both cases as we have already seen there is an immediate transition to the adultery. Additional support may be derived from such passages as

He that hath killed my king and whored my mother,  
where, be it noted, the same transition is immediately made. But the important point is that the reference to the adultery in the king's soliloquy in Q1 is in all probability made because reference to it follows reference to the murder in other parts of the play. It by no means implies necessarily that behind Q1 lies any other state of the play than that presented in authentic form in Q2 and F1. And enough has been said to show the tissue of associations present in the Q1 speech, and especially its connection with the Bedroom-scene.

We have already seen the connection of

I but still to perseuer in a sinne,  
It is an act gainst the vniversall power,

with the Council-scene at Act I scene 2. We referred to the phrase 'a fault to heaven' in that scene. In the Q1 version of the Council scene we have:

It is a fault gainst heaven, fault gainst the dead,  
A fault gainst nature, etc.

We have already seen how anxious the writer of the first stratum of the Q1 'copy' was to have his lines scan: this careful use of the monosyllabic gainst is a case in point. It does not occur in the 'good' texts. Its use in the Q1 prayer-scene's 'act gainst the vniversall power' likewise preserves metrical regularity. Now a little later in Act I scene 2, after the court has dispersed, Hamlet, left alone, begins his first soliloquy: and its subject is precisely the adultery and incest which is the subject of the bedroom-scene and which is treated of in the Q1 prayer-scene. The Q1 version of Hamlet's first soliloquy begins thus:

O that this too much grieu'de and sallied flesh  
Would melt to nothing, or that the universall  
Globe of heauen woulde turne al to a Chaos.

I suggest that the constructor of the Q1 king's soliloquy was influenced by this passage, just as he was influenced by a passage a little earlier in the same court-scene. It seems most probable, considering all the other cases of memorial association we have dealt with, that there is some connection between these two passages in Q1. Further, I suggest that this Hamlet soliloquy influenced the actual construction of the opening of the king's soliloquy: for this is quite different from its

opening in the other texts:

O that this wet that falles vpon my face  
Would wash the crime cleere from my conscience.

This seems to me to be modelled on the

O that this too too sullied flesh

opening. The basic structural element 'O that this....' is present in both, and the idea of wetness is found in both.

These opening words of the king's soliloquy in Q1 correspond to and were doubtless initially suggested by the following passage in the Q2 and F1 prayer-scene: (III iii 43 ff.):

What if this cursed hand  
Were thicker than itself in brother's blood,  
Is there not rain enough in the sweet heavens  
To wash it white as snow?

So it is in our view a sort of conflation of this passage and the earlier passage cited from Act I scene 2. But there is even more to be added; for at III i 49 seq. the king in an aside reproaches himself with his guilt, this time with his hypocrisy. He says:

O 'tis too true,  
How smart a lash that speech doth give my conscience.

Nothing would be easier than for a pirate to mix up subconsciously two passages in which the same character speaks in conscience-stricken terms. I am convinced that the king's line in the Q1 prayer-scene:

Would wash the crime clear from my conscience  
is itself a memorial conflation of III iii 47 ('To wash it white as snow') and III i 50 ('How smart a lash that speech doth give my conscience').

The phrase 'as white as snow' was caught up by the pirate from the 'good' version of the prayer-scene and reproduced in a different application referring to Claudius' sins instead of to a blood-stained hand. Later in the 'good' version of the king's speech occurs the ejaculation 'O bosom black as death'. The two opposites 'white as snow' and 'black as death', while they are used in two different connections by Shakespeare, are naturally associated and juxtaposed by the pirate. But a slight alteration is made: Q1 has 'black as jet' for 'black as death': the Q1 reading is a usual and conventional antithesis to 'white as snow' and there is no reason against supposing that the difference is due to the pirate. After all, it grows increasingly apparent that the memory with which we are dealing was a general and fairly vague one. The succeeding line in Q1:

Yet may contrition make them white as snow  
telescopes two passages of the speech in the full play, namely

Is there not rain enough in the sweet heavens  
To wash it white as snow?

and

Try what repentance can - what can it not? (III iii 65).

We have seen that the word wash had been reproduced by the pirate earlier in the speech; in addition to bringing together separated passages and conflating them, he is capable of separating words closely connected in the 'good' version and applying them in separate and quite different contexts, as in this case he separates wash and white as snow in the original phrase 'to wash it white as snow'. He remembers stray phrases of the full



version but not their precise context.

Q1's 'Most wretched man' seems obviously derived from an imperfect recollection of the 'good' texts' "O wretched state" (III iii 67) which immediately precedes 'O bosom black as death'. The Q1 'When I look up to heaven' echoes the corresponding 'Then I'll look up' of the 'good' texts (III iii 50). And the Q1 version 'stoope, bend thee to thy prayer' could have been suggested by the 'good' texts' "Bow stubborn knees" (III iii 70), while the fitting up of a concluding rhyme in 'despaire' is not without the reach of such a reconstructor as I believe we are concerned with.

It has previously been noted that reminiscences from other plays are sometimes found in piratical reconstructions. Certain undoubted cases occur in Q1 Hamlet, among them the complex one from Henry V with which we have already dealt. Mr Crompton Rhodes quotes another from Twelfth Night. In Q2 and F1 Hamlet Polonius says to Ophelia at I iii 127 ff.:

in few, Ophelia,  
Do not believe his vows, for they are brokers, etc.

In Q1 he says:

Come in, Ofelia; such men often proue  
Greate in their wordes, but little in their loue.

Compare Twelfth Night:

We men may say more, swear more, but indeed  
Our shows are more than will, for still we prove  
Much in our vows, but little in our love.

This is an undoubted case. But let us look at the way in which the association was made. As Mr Crompton Rhodes observes,

"Clearly, the mention of 'vows' has awakened his (i.e. the pirate's) memory of Viola's words to the Duke." 'Vows' occurs a little earlier in Q1:

How prodigall the tongue lends the heart vowes,  
and a line or two above that:

And withall, such earnest vowes.

This is what created the association with the Twelfth Night passage: but we must notice that when that passage is transferred to Q1 Hamlet 'Much in our vows' becomes 'Great in their words'. That is to say, the verbal link itself is unconsciously altered by the pirate. 'Vows' in Hamlet reminded him of a passage containing 'vows' in Twelfth Night, but he substituted, probably involuntarily, another word for the 'vows' of the latter even although it was itself the principal link in the chain of association.

Now in the king's soliloquy in the Q1 version of the prayer-scene Claudius says:

O these are sinnes that are vn pardonable:  
and there is no precise verbal parallel in the 'good' versions. In 3 Henry VI, however, at I iv 106, we have:

O 'tis a fault too too unpardonable!

This occurs in a scene about usurpation; and Claudius was a usurper. And there is a process of association visible which is exactly analogous to that we have shown in the case from Twelfth Night. Instead of an unpardonable fault Q1 has unpardonable sins. But the word fault occurs in the 'good' version

of the king's soliloquy, and also as we have seen elsewhere in that of the 'bad' quarto. I suggest that fault, which occurred in the full Hamlet, was remembered by the reconstructing pirate, and provided the verbal link with the passage quoted from 3 Henry VI; and that when the pirate transferred that line to his Hamlet he altered fault to sinnes, just as he had altered vows to words in the other example. The present case receives support from the former.

We have so far left unexamined the passage

The earth doth still crie out vpon my fact,  
Pay me.....

This has at its root, of course, a reference to the blood of Abel, slain by his brother, crying out in condemnation of him from the earth, as in the book of Genesis. The reference is apt as the elder Hamlet had been murdered by his brother. But it has no basis whatever in the full Shakespearean play.

Whatever explanation be given of this difficult passage, we cannot avoid believing from our examination of the rest of the speech that it was constructed by someone who had known the play so thoroughly that he was able to confuse different portions of it which, though widely separated, bore on much the same subjects. This agent had largely forgotten the details and arrangement of the play, and he had to botch up a version of the speech with the aid of his memory and an ability to write regular blank verse. We cannot believe that as it stands in Q1 the version represents either the Ur-Hamlet or an early Shakespearian play on the same subject, for in that case we would hardly expect different parts

of the play to be confused. Some of the sources I have suggested for words and phrases in the Q1 soliloquy may not prove acceptable: but some are clear, and even if we only base our case on a few certain examples we cannot dismiss them without explanation. The only explanation for these associations with other passages is the presence of a pirate, a memorial reconstructor; the only explanation of the regular blank verse is that this pirate had the ability to produce it. We cannot even assume readily that a pirate provided a hack-poet with notes of the full speech - very scanty and imperfect notes - for the extraordinarily close knitting together of originally widely separated passages, and the presence of clear links of association between the passages in question (links of association which are in some cases exceedingly complicated) necessitates the belief that it was the man who was writing the speech who was remembering and confusing the various passages.

We have reason to believe that this person's recollection of the full soliloquy was very vague and general. I want to suggest that in this line exemplifying the Cain-Abel motif we see the pirate reverting to type. We should expect references to 'stock' examples like the murder of Abel in the crude, conventional revenge type-dramas. Now in the Q1 speech we are examining there are two words used (not found in the 'good' texts) which are also characteristic of the stereotyped language avoided by the mature Shakespeare. The phrase 'as black as jet' occurs in Shakespeare only in two instances; (a) Black, forsooth;



coal-black as jet. II Henry VI II i 112. (b) Two proper pal-freys black as jet. Titus Andronicus V ii 50. These are both early plays, and both follow the conventions of their types in diction and plot fairly exactly - the one case a chronicle-play, the other a Senecan drama.

The word fact ('the earth doth still crie out upon my fact') is equally stereotyped and conventional. And in the works of Shakespeare it is likewise found only in the earlier, less mature, more conventional plays: for example

This fact was infamous and vile (I Henry VI IV ii)  
And a fouler fact did never traitor (2 Henry VI, I iii)  
whom we have apprehended in the fact (ibid. II i)  
one confederate in the fact (Titus Andronicus IV i) etc.

Such chrystallised terms, with their rigid connotations, were discarded by Shakespeare as his art grew; but we must remember that to a pirate struggling to botch up a version of his Hamlet that play was just another Revenge-drama. It is the easiest thing in the world to think of him putting in examples of the old formalised vocabulary of the chronicle and revenge plays; and I believe that this is the best explanation of these two words here. Further, I doubt if we would be over-daring in uttering the opinion that the conception of the earth crying our for vengeance is susceptible of a similar explanation; it may easily be the pirate reverting to type and supplying a piece of his own from his memory of more conventional revenge-plays.

We shall later be considering the possibility that at a few points in the Q1 text whoever was responsible for the re-

construction was confusing two separate versions of the same play, the old drama known as far back as 1589 at latest and Shakespeare's play as we know it. It is not impossible that the line which is worrying us at the moment is an example of that. That is to say, it (or something similar) may have existed in the Ur-Hamlet, and the pirate may have incorporated it in his reconstruction of Shakespeare's drama. But the important point is that we cannot on the basis of this line suggest that the play underlying the imperfect Quarto is an early Hamlet: for the bulk of the speech gives every indication of being a piratical reconstruction. It would be absurd to suppose for example that Shakespeare first wrote the speech in a form corresponding to its form in Q1, and then later took out bits here and there and placed them at widely separated places in his final version. It would be beyond credibility to suppose that the writer of the Ur-Hamlet had written the speech as it is in Q1, and that Shakespeare had transferred pieces to other positions in his version and rewritten the speech round what was left (for much of the Q1 speech corresponds as we have seen to parts of the final version of the same speech). We can be sure that the Q1 soliloquy is the result of piracy; and that is what we wish to maintain here. As we have seen, most of it corresponds to Shakespeare's final play at one point or another; and the passages drawn together in it are all connected by links of phraseology or content in such a way that a pirate would confuse them with ease. The small part that corresponds to nothing

in Shakespeare's play may be explained as the pirate's own contribution or as a memory of some other play or of some other, quite distinct, version of the Hamlet-play (which is really the same thing). We must accept the conclusion pointed to by the great bulk of the evidence provided by the text; especially when the small residue of the text can be explained reasonably in accordance with that. For if different plays tended to be confused, as we have seen they did, why might not two entirely different versions of the same play be momentarily confused by a pirate who wished to reproduce only one of them?

There is one other small point to be noticed with regard to this speech: the sequence of pronouns is imperfect, just as we have found it imperfect in other portions of the first stratum of the Q1 'copy'. It is the earth which cries out 'Pay me the murder' and in apposition is the line 'And the adulterous fault I have committed': strict grammatical structure would of course require 'the....fault you have (or thou hast) committed'. Thus we have a point of contact with a feature of the first stratum in scene 14 already noted: and we can pass to a fuller examination of that stratum in that scene.

#### Postscript:

Professor Boas (intro. Kyd, p. lli-liii) points out that the king's words:

The earth doth still crie out vpon my fact,  
Pay me the murder of a brother and a king.

recall the Murder of Iohn Brewen, by Kyd, "where of the first

fratricidal sin it is said: 'Albeit there was none in the world to accuse Cain for so foul a fact.....yet the blood of the just Abel cried most shrill in the ears of the righteous God for vengeance, and revenge on the murderer'." This may very well be so; and it would be consistent with our case to assume that the piratical writer of the king's speech in the first stratum of the Q1 manuscript had some such passage as this at the back of his mind when he was trying to produce something like Shakespeare's final version of the soliloquy. Whether a reference to the murder of Abel stood in the Ur-Hamlet or not, the character of the speech in Q1 has been determined with sufficient evidence: it is a cento of passages from many sources made by memory alone. That being so, nothing can be deduced from it respecting the Ur-Hamlet; for as we shall see at other points in this study the person responsible for the original version of the Q1 'copy' tended to confuse with Hamlet certain passages from Kyd, with so much exactness that we cannot suppose that they were found in the Ur-Hamlet. It is one of the habits of pirates to eke out their faulty memory of the play which they are attempting to reconstruct with reminiscences from other plays altogether. At such places, of course, these reminiscences have no bearing on the condition of the version of the play which is being reported.



## II.

Q1 SCENE vi LINES 1-18 and SCENE viii.

The first eighteen lines of Q1 scene vi correspond to II ii 1-39 of the authentic text; the King and Queen welcome Rosencrantz and Guildenstern to the court, and request them to attempt to discover the cause of Hamlet's strange conduct. Scene viii corresponds to III i 1-28, where Rosencrantz and Guildenstern report their failure to get this information from Hamlet, and announce the performance of "The Murder of Gonzago" which he has arranged; the last seventeen lines of scene viii correspond to III i 184-91, where Polonius arranges for the Queen to summon Hamlet to her closet after the play.

Both of these passages in Q1 are written in stilted blank verse: this is metrically regular apart from a small block of text in scene viii -- lines 24-31 -- and two other lines in that scene -- lines 1 and 10 -- which are short by a foot and a syllable respectively. Scene viii line 37 passes as metrical.

An analysis of the Q1 text shows that the two passages do not represent any authentic version of the play anterior or subsequent to the version given in Q2 or the stage-adaptation of that which is found in F1. On the contrary such an analysis gives results consistent with a slightly modified form of the hypothesis held by Mommsen, Creizenach and H. D. Gray,<sup>1</sup> who

---

1. See Mommsen, Athenaeum vol. 29 (1857) p. 182; Creizenach, Shakespeare Jahrbuch, vol. 42 (1906) pp. 80-4; Gray, Modern Language Review, vol. 10 pp. 171-80 and Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, vol. 42, pp. 721-35.

would argue that what underlies Q1 here is the full Q2 version itself, but that a second-rate versifier or hack-writer has supplemented inadequate reporting. Stray fragments of the Q2 text, sometimes from other points in the play, and even reminiscences of passages in other plays, are assembled and welded together into verse which is in the main metrically exact but poetically uninspired: and I am inclined to modify the Mommsen-Creizenach-Gray hypothesis somewhat, and suggest that the mind which recollected these various fragments and the hand which bound them together into verse belonged to the same person.

In addition to revealing the bringing together of fragments of the genuine text and phrases from other sources, an analysis of these passages in Q1 shows that there is a good deal of repetition, and that the two corresponding passages in the authentic versions have been confused by the reporter-versifier.

Let us take scene vi first: lines 4-7 admirably exemplify the versifying reporter's methods:

Therefore we doe desire, euen as you tender  
Our care to him, and our great loue to you,  
That you will labour but to wring from him  
The cause and ground of his distemperancie.

Part of this is echoed later in Q1, in scene xi lines 155-7:

Well sonne Hamlet, we in care of you: but specially  
in tender preservation of your health,  
The which we price euen as our proper selfe,....

At the point corresponding to this latter passage, the 'good' texts read as follows (IV iii 39-41):

Hamlet, this deed, for thine especial safety,  
Which we do tender, as we dearly grieve  
For that which thou hast done, must send thee hence...

The verb "tender" has formed in the reporter's mind an association-link with Henry V, II ii 56-9<sup>1</sup>:

Wee'l yet inlarge that man,  
Though Cambridge, Scroope, and Gray, in their deere care  
And tender preservation of our person  
Wold haue him punish'd.

(Fl).

Thus "tender", a verb in Hamlet IV iii 40, becomes an adjective in Q1 xi 156, as in Henry V II ii 58, and the alteration carries with it a substantial phraseological borrowing (with modifications) from that play, namely the words "in care of you" and "in tender preservation". The borrowing is indissolubly bound up with a fragment of the authentic Hamlet text; for the words "but specially", embedded in the borrowed material, come in all probability from a vague memory of "thine especial safety" (IV iii 39). "Tender" having become an adjective, the verb "price" is substituted for it (Q1 xi 157). Now in Q1 vi 4-5 the verb "tender" is an anticipation of IV iii 40: and not only is that passage anticipated but also the confusion of that passage with the lines quoted from Henry V: this accounts for the words "our care to him" in Q1 vi 5. It is extraordinary that, anticipating IV iii 40, the reporter should retain "tender" as a verb and yet also partially foreshadow the confusion of the later passage with Henry V which caused him to use "tender" as an adjective in scene xi line 156.

---

1. This matter has already been referred to in another connection (see Section 1, No. I).

Line 6 of Q1 scene vi contains another interesting confusion. The King desires that Rosencrantz and Guildenstern "will labour but to wring from" Hamlet the cause of his behaviour. Almost certainly the reporter had at the back of his mind a passage in Act I scene ii. Laertes has begged the King's permission to return to France; the King asks if he has his father's consent:-

King Have you your father's leave? what says Polonius?  
Pol. He hath, my lord, wrung from me my slow leave  
 By laboursome petition, and at last  
 Upon his will I sealed my hard consent.  
 I do beseech you give him leave to go.

This is derived from Q2: in F1 we have only

King Haue you your Fathers leaue? What sayes Pollonius?  
Pol. He hath my Lord:  
 I do beseech you giue him leaue to go.

But the omission is accidental, and not a playhouse cut;<sup>1</sup> for at the corresponding point (scene ii lines 21-3) Q1 has this:

King Haue you your fathers leaue, Leartes?  
Cor. He hath, my lord, wrung from me a forced graunt,  
 And I beseech you grant your Highnesse leaue.

I am confident that at vi 6 the Q1 reporter was influenced by a vague recollection of the full form of this passage as found in Q2: the juxtaposition of "wring" and "laboursome" on the one hand and "labour" and "wring" on the other can hardly be mere coincidence.

Q1 vi 7 ("The cause and ground of his distemperancie")<sup>2</sup>

1. See Dover Wilson, The Manuscript of Shakespeare's 'Hamlet', Vol. 1, pp. 22-3.

2. Cf. also Q1 scene ix line 189 -- "the ground and cause of your distemperature".



seems to be the result of the association of three separate passages in the play. The reporter was obviously indebted to III ii 338, where Rosencrantz asks Hamlet "Good my lord, what is your cause of distemper?" But in all probability he also had at the back of his mind II ii 54-5, where synonyms are used (though different from those in Q1): the King tells the Queen Polonius's news --

He tells me, my dear Gertrude, he hath found  
The head and source of all your son's distemper.

Lastly, the reporter uses the word "ground", anticipating the Gravediggers' scene and forgetting or ignoring the pun: again Hamlet's "madness" is being discussed:-

Ham. How came he mad?

1 Clo. Very strangely, they say.

Ham. How strangely?

1 Clo. Faith, e'en with losing his wits.

Ham. Upon what ground?

1 Clo. Why, here in Denmark:...

Here, then, we have four lines towards the beginning of Q1 scene vi, consisting of various fragments gathered together from widely separated source-passages and woven into a complex metrical whole. We appear to be examining the work of a versifier who had at one time had a wide knowledge of the full play and who still remembered patches here and there.

One or two phrases from II ii 1-39 itself have stuck in this reporter-versifier's memory. Take the following passage (Q1 vi 9-15):

Ros. My Lord, whatsoeuer lies within our power  
Your maiestie may more commaund in wordes  
Then vse perswasions to your liege men, bound  
By loue, by duetie, and obedience.

Gil. What we may doe for both your Maiesties  
 To know the griefe troubles the Prince your sonne,  
 We will indeuour all the best we may,....

Clearly the reporter remembered, though not very distinctly,

II ii 26-9: Rosencrantz says

Both your majesties  
 Might by the sovereign power you have of us,  
 Put your dread pleasures more into command  
 Than to entreaty.

The word "power" was present in the reporter's mind, but detached from its context: also present in his mind was a passage a few lines earlier (II ii 17-8), where the King asks Hamlet's two friends to gather "whether aught to us unknown afflicts him thus, / That opened lies within our remedy". Thus, from broken phrases recollected without their setting, the reporter produced "whatsoever lies within our power". He produced "may more commaund" from the authentic texts' "might...put...more into command"; and he remembered the words "both your majesties", which, however, he misplaced. But even here in vi 9-15 his text is influenced by reminiscences of passages in other scenes. "We will indeuour all the best we may" suggests a reminiscence of Hamlet's words to his mother at I ii 120 -- "I shall in all my best obey you"; and the words "by duetie and obedience" recall Polonius's words at II ii 107-8 about his daughter "who in her duty and obedience, mark, / Hath given me this". In Q1 vi 14 Guildenstern talks of the "griefe" which "troubles" Hamlet: "griefe" might be a reminiscence of any of several lines in the play, for example III i 180 where Polonius talks of "the origin and commencement of his grief" and, a few lines later, says "Let

his queen-mother all alone entreat him / To show his grief" (III i 185-6): "troubles" corresponds to "afflicts" in the 'good' texts (II ii 17), and may have its source in a dim recollection of Hamlet's reaction to the narrative of Horatio, Marcellus and Barnardo at I ii 224 -- "Indeed, indeed, sirs, but this troubles me". The reporter repeats this verb later on, in scene vii line 2, where after witnessing the meeting between Hamlet and Ophelia the King says "Loue? No, no, that's not the cause, / Some deeper thing it is that troubles him".

At one point in scene vi the reporter has apparently modelled his construction upon a fragment of the genuine text while maintaining independence for the most part as regards phrasing. The scene begins thus:

Right noble friends, that our deere cosin Hamlet  
Hath lost the very heart of all his sence,  
It is most right, and we most sory for him:

And much later in Q1 the King says to the incensed Laertes

....that your father is murdred,  
'Tis true, and we most sory for it,....

(scene xiii lines 57-8)

Again the reporter-versifier repeats himself. Now we have already noted one case where he neglects a quibble; and it seems to me not impossible that when he wrote the first three lines of scene vi the reporter was influenced by the sense and construction of II ii 97-8 of the authentic text, though not by the actual wording: there Polonius says

That he is mad 'tis true, 'tis true, 'tis pity,  
And pity 'tis 'tis true.

It is interesting to observe further that in the passage directly corresponding to Q1 scene viii Polonius uses the words "'Tis most true" in another connection (III i 21): we shall find later that the reporter confuses scenes vi and viii at certain points in the latter.

In the first line of scene vi the King addresses Rosencrantz and Guildenstern as "Right noble friends"; in the 'good' texts, at II ii 58, he greets Cornelius and Voltemand with the words "Welcome, my good friends". And Q1 vi l "our deere cosin Hamlet" can be explained as a reminiscence of I ii 64 ("But now my cousin Hamlet, and my son") or III ii 90 ("How fares our cousin Hamlet"): compare also I ii 117 and V ii 257.

Finally, the last two lines of Q1 scene vi reproduce II ii 33-4, with an inversion and with the corruption of the proper names which appears throughout the text:

Q1:

King Thankes Guilderstone, and gentle Rossencraft.  
Que. Thankes Rossencraft, and gentle Gilderstone.

The received text:

King Thanks Rosencrantz, and gentle Guildenstern.  
Queen Thanks Guildenstern, and gentle Rosencrantz.

Q1 scene vi lines 1-18 and scene viii are closely connected. In the first place certain phrases used in scene vi, for which sources have been suggested, are repeated, or at least clearly echoed, in scene viii. Thus with vi 15 ("We will indeuour all the best we may") compare viii 5 ("we haue done all the best we could"): in both cases the speaker is Guildenstern. At vi 6-7



we have "...but to wring from him / The cause and ground of his distemperancie", and at viii 6 "To wring from him the cause of all his griefe".<sup>1</sup> In vi 8 the King says "the king of Denmarke shal be thankefull", and in viii 16 "And we vnto your selues will still be thankefull". Further, "the king of Denmarke" is balanced in viii 18 by "the Queene of Denmarke".

In the second place, there are two points in scene viii where the reporter had in mind passages in that part of the authentic text which corresponds to scene vi 1-18. At viii 3-4 the King says to Rosencrantz and Guildenstern

You being so neere in loue, euen from his youth,  
Me thinkes should gaine more than a stranger should.

This corresponds to II ii 10 ff.:

I entreat you both,  
That being of so young days brought up with him,  
And sith so neighboured to his youth and haviour,  
That you vouchsafe your rest here in our court  
.....

.....to gather  
So much as from occasion you may glean.....

And at Q1 viii 18-9 the Queen says to them:

Thankes gentlemen, and what the Queene of Denmarke  
May pleasure you, be sure you shall not want.

In the passage in the authentic texts corresponding to Q1 viii 1-23 there is no mention of reward for the two young men's spying activity; but at II ii 25-6 the Queen tells them:

Your visitation shall receive such thanks  
As fits a king's remembrance.

---

1. "Griefe" appears in vi 14, and "the very ground / Of his distemperance" in viii 26-7.

In scene viii also we find gathered together reminiscences of various passages of the genuine text. Take the first two lines of the scene:

Lordes,<sup>1</sup> can you by no meanes finde  
The cause of our sonne Hamlets lunacie?

The reporter has remembered the phrase "by no means" from the corresponding scene in the authentic text: there Rosencrantz says (III i 5-6) --

He does confess he feels himself distracted  
But from what cause a' will by no means speak.

But the phrase is recollected in isolation and fitted to a new context.

At III i 4 the King speaks of Hamlet's "turbulent and dangerous lunacy"; but the reporter remembered another passage containing this word "lunacy", namely II ii 48-9 where Polonius says to the King "I do think.....I have found / The very cause of Hamlet's lunacy". Recollecting words from this passage and the construction of III i 1-2 ("And can you by no drift of conference / Get from him why...."), and using his own power of versification, the reporter has produced the question "can you by no means finde / The cause of our sonne Hamlets lunacie?" We have a further indication that II ii 48-9 was in the reporter's mind in the fact that at viii 26-7 Q1 has the phrase "the very ground / Of his distemperance": here there is a thorough confusion between "the very cause of Hamlet's lunacy" and Q1 vi 7

---

1. Cf. the similar opening of Q1 scene ii, where the King says "Lordes, we here haue writ to Fortenbrasse.....".

("The cause and ground of his distemperancie") -- a line which has already been annotated.

An interesting case of confusion with another passage is found in two lines spoken by the Queen (viii 18-9) in reply to Rosencrantz and Guildenstern:

Both In all we can, be sure you shall commaund.  
Queene Thankes gentlemen, and what the Queene of Denmarke  
 May pleasure you, be sure you shall not want.

"In all we can" is an echo of vi 15 ("all the best we may") and viii 5 ("all the best we could"), and the word "in" renders even more probable the suggested derivation from Hamlet's "I shall in all my best obey you, madam" (I ii 120). "Be sure you shall commaund" reminds one of scene vi again, where Rosencrantz says "Your maiestie may more commaund in wordes / Then vse perswasions" (derived from II ii 26-9); and we may notice also that at III ii 323 Hamlet says to Rosencrantz and Guildenstern "such answer as I can make you shall command" (we have already noted cases where phrases are remembered in isolation, apart from their original contexts). But however this may be, the Queen's reply in the passage quoted from Q1 scene viii instantly recalls Hamlet's assurance to Horatio and Marcellus after they have sworn not to reveal the Ghost's appearance (I v 184-6, Q1 scene iv lines 228-9): this reads in Q1 as follows --

And what so poore a man as Hamlet may  
 To pleasure you, God willing shall not want,...

and in the good texts thus:

And what so poor a man as Hamlet is  
 May do t'express his love and friending to you  
 God willing shall not lack.

It was the Q1 version of this which was in the reporter's mind when he wrote viii 18-19; but there is no reason to suppose that version is not derived from the other.

Verbal contacts exist between Q1 viii 11-12 and III i 20 ff.:

Q1:-

(Ross.) He hath giuen order for a play to night,  
At which he craues your highnesse company.

The received text:-

(Ros.) .....they have already order  
This night to play before him.

Pol. 'Tis most true  
And he beseeched me to entreat your majesties  
To hear and see the matter.

A comparison of the King's reply in each version is illuminating. In the 'good' texts (III i 24-5) he says

With all my heart, and it doth much content me  
To hear him so inclined.

Q1 reproduces the first four words, altering "my" to the royal "our", and then confuses this reply with that made by the King to Voltemand at II ii 80 -- "It likes us well"; thus Q1 viii 13 reads "With all our heart, it likes vs very well". "It likes vs well" is repeated at viii 37, and "With all my heart" (spoken this time by the Queen) at viii 38. But the remainder of III i 24-5 has also contributed to Q1 scene viii: their content is reproduced there in lines 22-3, where the Queen says

.....it ioyes me at the soule  
He is inclin'd to any kinde of mirth.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Note that "inclin'd to mirth" also occurs in Q1 scene viii line 9.



"Inclined" is derived from III i 25: "any kinde of mirth" is indebted to a recollection of "a kind of joy" (III i 18). "Mirth" itself is probably a reminiscence of II ii 299, where Hamlet says to Rosencrantz and Guildenstern "I have of late... lost all my mirth". But "a kind of joy" also stands behind Q1's "it ioyes me at the soule" (viii 22). In these scenes which we are examining, the reporter has remembered the general content of the authentic version and certain words and phrases; but very often he has failed to recall the exact context of these, and has fitted them into new settings.

Another passage full of reminiscences of various parts of the play occurs towards the end of scene viii (lines 31-6): Corambis is the speaker.

...soone when the sports are done,  
 Madam, send you in haste to speake with him,  
 And I my selfe will stand behind the Arras,  
 There question you the cause of all his griefe,  
 And then in loue and nature vnto you, hee'le tell you all:  
 My Lord, how thinke you on't?

The corresponding passage in the 'good' texts (III i 184-8) runs as follows:

But if you hold it fit, after the play,  
 Let his queen-mother all alone entreat him  
 To show his grief, let her be round with him,  
 And I'll be placed (so please you) in the ear  
 Of all their conference.

The phrase "to show his grief" probably underlies the last line of Q1 scene viii, where Corambis expresses the hope that Hamlet's "griefe will be reueal'd to her".

Corambis' words "send you in haste to speake with him"

anticipate Act III scene ii, where Rosencrantz and Guildenstern actually deliver the Queen's message to Hamlet. At III ii 312-3 Guildenstern says "The queen your mother, in the most great affliction of spirit, hath sent me to you"; a little further on (line 332) Rosencrantz says "She desires to speak with you in her closet ere you go to bed": later Polonius enters and delivers the same message (III ii 376) -- "My lord, the queen would speak with you, and presently".

Corambis states that he will "stand behind the Arras". The reporter doubtless remembered something of III iii 27-9, where Polonius says to the King

My lord, he's going to his mother's closet --  
Behind the arras I'll convey myself  
To hear the process....

(Compare also II ii 163 and IV 1 9).

Q1 viii 34 -- "There question you the cause of all his griefe" -- reminds us of the interview itself, where Hamlet says to his mother "you question with a wicked tongue" (III iv 12). "The cause of all his griefe", already used in the sixth line of this scene in Q1, is a conflation of "the origin and commencement of his grief" (III i 180) and "what is your cause of distemper" (III ii 338) or perhaps "the very cause of Hamlet's lunacy" (II ii 49).

Corambis says that Hamlet will be frank with his mother "in loue and nature". The word "nature", in this same sense, is used in the 'good' texts, also in connection with Hamlet's interview with his mother, at III ii 395-6: Hamlet says "soft,

now to my mother -- / O heart, lose not thy nature". The word is also used of Hamlet's filial obligations to his dead father at I v 81.

I suggest that the words "hee'le tell you all" provide us with another instance of the reporter remembering a phrase quite apart from its context. At III ii 140 Hamlet exclaims "The players cannot keep counsel, they'll tell all": a line or two later we have "be not you ashamed to show, he'll not shame to tell you what it means". The "he" is the prologue-speaker -- "this fellow". Now in Q1, at the corresponding point to this, there is a good deal of confusion: but what concerns us here is scene ix line 89, where Hamlet says "this fellow will tell you all". The reporter has clearly derived this from the authentic text; and I suggest that "hee'le tell you all", Q1 viii 35, was written with this in mind but divorced from its context. I doubt if coincidence is a credible hypothesis here.

Corambis' concluding words in the extract with which we are dealing -- "My Lord, how thinke you on't?" -- doubtless contain the versifying reporter's recollection of III i 178, where the King, asking Polonius's opinion of the plan to send Hamlet to England, says "What think you on't?" Again the reporter remembers the words but not the context; for there is no mention in Q1 scene viii of the King's own plan.

At one point in Q1 scene viii the metre breaks down seriously, and the text becomes incoherent (lines 27-9). The lines conclude a speech of Corambis which begins with the words

"Madame, I pray be ruled by me"; here the reporter was probably influenced by either of two passages in the authentic text. At I iv 81 Horatio, trying to dissuade Hamlet from following the Ghost, cries "Be ruled, you shall not go"; and at IV vii 58 the King asks Laertes "Will you be ruled by me?" (A few lines later, at the beginning of a passage present in Q2 but omitted in F1, Laertes says "My lord, I will be ruled" -- IV vii 67).

The lines in which the Q1 text deteriorates so strikingly run as follows:

..therefore  
I holde it meete, if so it please you,  
Else they shall not neete, and thus it is.

It is clear from the lines which follow this that Corambis is intent on his plan for the interview between Hamlet and the Queen, to be observed by him himself. It is therefore all the more likely that the reporter had a hazy memory of III iii 31:

'Tis meet that some more audience than a mother,  
Since nature makes them partial, should O'erhear  
The speech of vantage;....

And probably the sound of "meet" brought to his mind another passage also: he was writing about one of the tests to which Hamlet is subjected -- an interview; the words "else they shall not meete" mean, as is seen from the sequel, that Hamlet and the Queen should not hold converse except under observation. Quite possibly the reporter has remembered just one word which is used in the authentic texts in connection with another test which Hamlet undergoes in similar circumstances -- the interview with Ophelia. At II ii 213 Polonius says, in an aside, "I will



leave him, and suddenly contrive the means of meeting between him and my daughter".

Without claiming that the foregoing analysis is necessarily complete, I think we have good evidence that memory underlies the text of Q1 scene vi lines 1-18 and scene viii. That text is a cento of more or less dimly remembered fragments of the authentic text, and worked into blank verse which is for the most part metrically regular. There can be no authentic manuscript of the play at any stage of its history behind the Q1 text at these points: nor is there any indication that the versifying reporter was concerned with any Hamlet other than that given in Q2 or F1. He was a pretty poor hack-writer: he uses colourless, conventional phraseological formulae where Shakespeare writes vital and original verse. That such verse as is contained in the passages we have examined should ever have been attributed to Shakespeare in his youth passes comprehension; Shakespeare's youthful verse is quite different. Nor can I see in this verse of Q1 the slightest resemblance to the style of Kyd. But all the conditions presented here by Q1 are met by the hypothesis of a third-rate verse-monger who had a fragmentary knowledge of the Shakespearian play, who used words and phrases recollected from various passages throughout that play, and who could at the pinch of necessity use his invention.

One of the most striking characteristics of this verse-monger is his tendency to repeat words and phrases. We have already noted the repetition in scene viii of formulae used in

scene vi. We may conclude this section by listing together the repetitions within scene viii itself: "by no meanes" (lines 1 and 7); "the cause of all his griefe" (lines 6 and 34);<sup>1</sup> "inclin'd to mirth" (lines 9 and 23);<sup>2</sup> "with all our (my) heart" (lines 13 and 38); "it likes vs (very) well" (lines 13 and 37); "be sure" (lines 17 and 19); "my selfe" (lines 33 and 39); "send" (lines 32 and 38).

---

1. "griefe" itself also occurs in line 40.

2. "mirth" itself also occurs in line 14.

## III.

Secne 14.

(Horatio and the Queen.)

I have suggested that the 'copy' for this scene was composite,<sup>1</sup> and that one of the two interpolations forming the second stratum of text consists of the words "and withall, commend me / A mothers care to him," (lines 18-19). I have described the process whereby the insertion of this short passage in the 'copy' resulted in the compositor mis-dividing the two immediately following lines of the original stratum, which, correctly arranged, run thus:

Bid him a while be wary of his presence,  
Lest that he faile in that he goes about.

Let us now examine the composition of the first of these lines.

It appears to me to be an extraordinarily complex memorial conflation of three separate passages which occur much earlier in the play. At II i 70 in the received text Polonius says to Reynaldo "And let him (i.e. Laertes) ply his music". This is rendered in Q1 scene v as "And bid him ply his learning..." (line 3) and again at the end of the same scene "And bid him ply his musicke" (line 30). The first of these lines occurs in what Professor Dover Wilson regards as the original stratum of the composite manuscript behind Q1. Note that here a parent is sending instructions to a son through a third party, just as in the lines in scene xiv which we have before us.

---

1. See Section 1, sub-section I.

Secondly, compare the passage quoted from Q1 scene xiv with I iii 43 of the received text, where Laertes instructs Ophelia to "Be wary then -- best safety lies in fear.....". And thirdly, compare I iii 121, where Polonius directs Ophelia to "Be something scanter of your maiden presence".

Placing the line "Bid him a while be wary of his presence" beside these three previous lines, in the order mentioned, I cannot see how the conclusion can be avoided that the verse of the original stratum of Q1 scene xiv is not that of the Ur-Hamlet nor of an early Shakespearian Hamlet, but composed by someone who here drew on his memory of fragments of earlier passages:-

(earlier passages) And bid him ply his learning..... (Q1 sc. v line 3)

Be wary then..... (Q2 I iii 43)

Be...scanter of your...presence (Q2 I iii 121)

Q1 xiv 19-20 Bid him a while be wary of his presence.

Another interesting point may be noticed here. In this scene peculiar to Q1 Horatio tells the Queen that Hamlet has arrived back in Denmark and that he (Horatio) is to meet him by appointment on the morrow:

Yes Madame, and he hath appoynted me  
To meete him on the east side of the Cittie  
To morrow morning.

In the 'good' texts Hamlet writes three letters. One is to his mother and of its contents we hear nothing. Another is to the King, and it contains the words

Tomorrow shall I beg leave to see your kingly eyes....  
(IV vii 43-4)



The third is to Horatio, containing this:-

and repair thou to me with as much speed as thou  
wouldest fly death....

(IV vi 23-4).

The time sequence in the 'good' texts is completely in accordance with dramatic propriety. Immediately on landing, Hamlet wishes to consult his only friend and confidant. After the "interim", which is his, he goes to the King, ready at last to accomplish his revenge. In Q1, on the other hand, we have to imagine him waiting for a comparatively long space of time before interviewing Horatio: and there is nothing for him to do during that time. There is in Q1 a gap of over a night with no dramatic significance; and that there should be so long a delay before Hamlet sees the only friend in whom he can confide at a time of crisis conflicts with dramatic probability. Is it not clear that the writer of the verse of the first stratum of this scene has mixed up the contents of the two letters written by Hamlet to the King and Horatio in the received text? He has transferred the time of Hamlet's appointment with the King to that with Horatio, and in so doing has damaged dramatic propriety.

More will be said about this scene in the third section, but we may note here that as in other passages of non-Shakespearean verse which we have examined we find repetitions of words within a short space. Within seven lines the word "treason" is twice applied to the King (lines 4 and 10), and at the end of the scene we have this:-

Thanks be to heauen for blessing of the prince,  
Horatio once againe I take my leaue,  
With thowsand mothers blessings to my sonne.

## IV.

SCENES 3 AND 4.

As far as I can see, there are in scene 3 no indications of interference by an interpolating reviser. Yet there are decisive marks of piratical transmission of the text. For one thing there is the 'quotation' from Twelfth Night to which reference has been made in No. I of this section:

such men often proue,  
Greate in their wordes, but little in their loue.

And there is the double repetition of both prodigall and your maiden presence:

(a) t'is giuen me to vnderstand,  
That you haue bin too prodigall of your maiden presence  
Vnto Prince Hamlet.....

(b) How prodigall the tongue lends the heart vowes.....

Each phrase occurs in the 'good' texts only once:

how prodigal the soul  
Lends the tongue vows..... (I iii 116-7).

and:

Be something scanter of your maiden presence (ibid. 121).  
Not only the repetition in Q1 but also the misplacements, suggest imperfect memorial reconstruction; for to the first of the passages quoted ((a) above) corresponds in the 'good' texts:

'Tis told me he hath very oft of late  
Given private time to you, and you yourself  
Have of your audience been most free and bounteous.

(I iii 91-93)

where there is no mention whatever of 'prodigal' or her 'maiden presence'.

Q1 has the phrase 'And withall, such earnest vows', corresponding to the good texts' line -

With almost all the holy vows of heaven (I iii 114).

A good example of the sort of transference of phrases which occurs in a pirated text can be seen from Q1 scene 6 where Ophelia speaks to Hamlet of these same things. There Q1 has, in a passage not interpolated:

My Lord, you know right well you did.  
And with them such earnest vows of loue.....

while the other texts have no verbal parallel at all: the passage appears there as:

My honoured lord, you know right well you did,  
And with them words of so sweet breath composed.....

(III i 97-8)

In scene 3 we might also point to the extraordinary syntax of the following passage:

But my deere brother, do not you  
Like to a cunning Sophister,  
Teach me the path and ready way to heauen,  
While you forgetting what is said to me,  
Your selfe, like to a carelesse libertine  
Doth giue his heart, his appetite at full,  
And little recks how that his honour dies.

In dealing with scene 14 we discovered in the original stratum of the text more than one example of bad pronoun sequences: here is a case at least nearly as bad. Lack of skill in the use of personal pronouns is a characteristic defect of the first level of the Q1 text.

Again, Ophelia says in Q1 scene 3:

Brother, to this I haue lent attentiu eare.

This is not found in the 'good' texts. But the source of the underlined phrase can be traced to a memorial conflation of two separate passages. At I ii 192-3 we have this:

Season your admiration for a while  
With an attent ear till I may deliver....

'Attentue' is, of course, merely such a vulgarisation of the Shakespearian 'attent' as we should expect from a pirate. Indeed the Q1 passage corresponding to I ii 193 has 'attentue'. In the second place, at I v 5-6 in the 'good' texts there occurs the passage:

Pity me not, but lend thy serious hearing  
To what I shall unfold.....

The import of these two passages is, of course, the same; and the line in Q1 scene 3 which is concerning us could easily comprise a conflation of elements from both. It is all the more interesting to note that the passage in Q1 which corresponds directly to the last-quoted lines runs:

Nay pittty me not, but to my vnfoldng  
Lend thy listning eare.....

where 'eare' testifies to the confusion existent between I ii 193 and I v 5 - a confusion which also accounts for the Q1 line:

Brother, to this I haue lent attentue eare.

In scene 4 there is a good example of confusion between different plays altogether. The following constitutes a good metrical line which there is no reason for supposing not to have stood in what Dover Wilson would consider the original stratum of the manuscript behind Q1:



Ham. Murder.

Ghost      Yea, murder in the highest degree.....

That this line owes its phrasing to Richard III there can be no doubt. Act V scene iii lines 200-1 of that play read:

Perjury, perjury, in the highest degree;

Murder, stern murder, in the direst degree.....

An imperfect recollection of this line, confused with the Hamlet passage, accounts convincingly for our Q1 line.

Two phrases are repeated in Q1 scene 4 whereas in the other editions each is spoken only once: they are Briefe let me be and Still am I called.

Two words are anticipated in one line, and are consequently repeated in the next:

Q1, sc. 4:                   a damnd pernitiuous villaine  
Murderons, bawdy, smiling damned villaine.....

Good texts      O most pernicious woman!

I v 105-6: O villain, villain, smiling damned villain!

It is also noticeable that the second line of the Q1 quotation, owing its second half to the corresponding line in the full text, owes its first half to a passage in the 'rogue and peasant slave' soliloquy:

Bloody, bawdy villain!  
Remorseless, treacherous, lecherous, kindless villain!

(II ii 583-4)

This is yet another case of anticipation: and it is ~~only~~ in the very next line that there occur those brackets which Professor Wilson took to indicate a Shakespearian manuscript behind this part of the quarto text:

(My tables) meet it is I set it downe...

That the immediately preceding two lines exhibit characteristics of memorial piracy weakens this contention; and on the other hand as has been elsewhere maintained such devices of dramatic punctuation would be known to anyone connected with the theatre.

Where Q1 has:

But sent vnto my graue,  
With all my accompts and sinnes vpon my head,

the other texts have:

but sent to my account  
With all my imperfections on my head (I v 78-79).

The Q1 perversion is clearly the result of faulty memory.

Shakespeare's subtlest strokes are those which we should expect a memorial reconstructor to miss most readily. It is so in the case of the repeated oath at the end of Act I scene 5. In the 'good' texts we have:

Never make known what you have seen tonight (line 144)  
Never to speak of this that you have seen ( " 153)  
Never to speak of this that you have heard ( " 160)

Q1 has seene in all three cases.

Examples of corruption due to memorial transmission could be multiplied in these two scenes, but these will suffice at this point. There are evidences of memorial reconstruction in passages where there is no evidence at all of interpolation.

## V.

SCENE 11: THE BEDROOM SCENE.

The text of this scene in Q1 is riddled with evidence of memorial reconstruction at points where there is absolutely no reason for assuming interference by an interpolator. Some of this evidence has already been referred to; and the examination of one important passage must be deferred to the Chapter in which the problem of the character of the Queen is considered. It will suffice here to list certain lines which have been transferred to this scene from other places by memorial association; it is not necessarily a complete list.

1. 'Madame, I'll shrowde my selfe behind the Arras' (see Sect. I No. IV). The 'arras' does not occur here in the 'good' texts; but on three occasions the phrase 'behind the arras' is found in these texts, viz:-

II ii 163 'Be you and I behind an arras then' (in connection with the planning of the Nunnery-test).

III iii 28 'Behind the arras I'll convey myself' (in connection with the planning of the Bedroom-test).

IV i 9 'Behind the arras hearing something stir' (in the Queen's description of the Bedroom-episode).

In view of its position here in Q1 it is most probable that the second of these cases is the source required.

2. In the Q1 scene Hamlet and his mother twice exchange the same conversation. Almost immediately on Hamlet's entry we

have: (Ham.) How i'st with you mother?  
Queen How i'st with you?

and after the Ghost has appeared we have again:

Ham. How i'st with you Lady?  
Queen Nay, how i'st with you.....

The words are found (in nearly the same form) only in the latter position in the 'good' texts. It is a case of anticipation and consequent repetition.

3. The passage:

Whose heart went hand in hand euen with that vow,  
 He made to you in marriage

is transferred from I v 49-50, where the words are spoken, in slightly different form, by the Ghost to Hamlet.

4. The line:

To liue in the incestuous pleasure of his bed..

is transferred from III iii 90. It is found also in Q1 at that point (the Prayer-scene) in a passage which from the metre and lineation is believed to be an interpolation.

5. The line:

Nay but still to persist and dwell in sinne  
 has been dealt with in Section 2, No. I, which see. Its ultimate source was traced to Act I scene ii.

6. The line:

....if euer you did my deare father loue  
 is transferred from I v 23, where it is spoken, in modified



form, by the Ghost. I v 21 contributes the word blazon to the Q1 context. The whole context will be analysed in Section 3 No. III below. Meanwhile, taking this paragraph with paragraph 3 above, it will be seen that Act I scene 5 has contributed much to the composition of parts of this scene in Q1 which show no signs of the interpolating reviser.

7. After Hamlet's exit with the dead body and the king's entry the latter talks of 'our deare brother of England'. This phrase does not occur in either Q2 or F1. The king of England is only referred to twice in these texts, and in both references he is apostrophised as 'England' (IV iii 57, *ibid.* 64). The phrase 'our dear brother of England' can only be an ornamented reminiscence of Henry V II iv, where at line 80 in the Folio we have:

From our brother of England?

and at lines 119-120:

To morrow shall you bear our full intent  
Back to our brother of England.

The person responsible for the reading in Q1 Hamlet had some acquaintance with this scene in Henry V at the French court. He may have acted in it, though not necessarily.

8. This last point, involving a reminiscence from Henry V, receives support from another bigger reminiscence of the same play. The passage:

Well sonne Hamlet, we in care of you.....The winde sits  
faire, you shall aboorde to night

has been analysed in Section 1 No. I, where its great debt to

Henry V II ii has been demonstrated.

9. The line 'Nay but still to persist and dwell in sinne' goes back to I ii 92-3 (see paragraph 5 above). In the immediately succeeding lines there are other possible derivations from Act I scene 2. Take the lines:

To make increase of shame, to seale damnation.  
Queen Hamlet, no more.  
Ham. Why appetite with you is in the waine.....

It is by no means incredible to suppose that the writer of this had away back in his mind the phrase 'increase of appetite' at I ii 144. This phrase has here got split up, but it is still traceable.

10. The line 'To sweate vnder the yoke of infamie' may owe something to III i 77 ('To grunt and sweat under a weary life'). And if the phrase 'to seale damnation' owes anything to the line 'Where every god did seem to set his seal' in the 'good' version of the Bedroom-scene (with the sense utterly perverted) we complete a passage whose elements are drawn from several different parts of the play, fused in the mind of a reconstructing pirate ('Nay but still to persist.....appetite with you is in the waine'). In particular we notice in this scene the comparatively large number of transferences from the first act of the play.

Sufficient has been said to put beyond doubt the memorial nature of the transmission of those parts of the text of this scene which must, according to Professor Dover Wilson's hypothesis, have stood in the original Q1 manuscript before any interpolations were made at all.

THE MARCELLUS THEORY.

In 1918 Professor Dover Wilson<sup>1</sup> argued, as we have already seen, that the 'copy' for Q1 Hamlet was a composite manuscript. The basic stratum consisted of an abridged transcript of the so-called Ur-Hamlet partially revised by Shakespeare. In this stratum, metre and line-division are regular. The second stratum consisted of interpolations made from memory by a pirate-actor who had taken a number of minor parts in the finally revised Shakespearian play as acted. Here, metre and line-division are generally faulty. We are now in a position to suggest a radical alteration in this hypothesis. There are certainly points in Q1 where the 'copy' was in all probability composite. But the original, as well as the later, stratum of the text owes its existence to memorial reconstruction. Passages of verse where conditions of metre and line-division are absolutely regular (so that on Professor Dover Wilson's hypothesis they belong to the transcript) have been shown to exhibit the clearest signs of memorial transmission. And passages of absolutely regular verse which have no direct relation to the corresponding passages in Q2 and F1 (so that on Professor Wilson's theory they belong to the unrevised portion of the transcript -- i.e. go back to the Ur-Hamlet) have also been shown to contain the most

---

1. The Library, Vol. IX, pp. 153-85 and 217-47.

definite evidences of composition by an inferior poet who combined remembered fragments of the final Shakespearian play and thus produced verse of his own.

Now the parts which Professor Wilson allocated to his interpolating pirate-actor were these: Marcellus, Voltemar, a Player, Fortinbras's Captain, the second Grave-digger, the churlish Priest, and one of the English ambassadors. He showed absolutely conclusively that the written 'part' of Voltemar ( or an accurate transcript of it) was used in the preparation of the Q1 'copy': this part of his work will stand permanently. The matter is clinched by the punctuation-links between the Q1 and F1 versions of Voltemar (Voltemand)'s long speech at II ii 60-80. Furthermore, it seems almost certain that the actor of the part of Voltemar played one of the English ambassadors who appear at the very end of the play, for the last stage-direction in Q1 reads "Enter Voltemar and the Ambassadors from England. enter Fortenbrasse with his traine". What is Voltemar doing in this galley? Obviously a reporter remembered that the actor who played Voltemar appeared on the stage at this point, so he inserted the name "Voltemar" in this stage-direction: but he did not realise that the said actor was appearing here in another part -- that of one of the English ambassadors.

As regards the other minor parts taken by Professor Wilson's interpolating actor, the main criterion used to determine them was the existence of interpolations in the Q1 text at points where one or another of these characters was present. For



Professor Wilson assumed that the pirate-actor would only be able to interpolate at points where he himself appeared on the stage. Thus the reason for his assumption that the pirate-actor took the part of Marcellus was not the excellence of the Q1 text of the scenes in which that character appears. That excellence was due to the fact that, as Professor Wilson maintained, the bulk of the Q1 text of these scenes appeared in the abridged transcript. Moreover, in the course of the partial revision to which Shakespeare had subjected the Ur-Hamlet before the abridged transcript was made, the scenes in which Marcellus appears (scenes in the early part of the play) had already been brought very near their final state. What made Professor Wilson decide that the pirate-actor played Marcellus was the presence in Q1 of passages containing metrical and structural irregularities in the scenes in which he appeared on the stage. These irregular passages could not have stood in the transcript; they must be interpolations. Therefore the pirate-actor must have been on the stage. By a process of elimination of the other characters who were on the stage in these scenes, Marcellus was identified as the reporting actor.

But what is the position if we cannot believe in the existence of the abridged transcript behind Q1? Here we come to Professor H. D. Gray.<sup>1</sup> In 1915 he had suggested that the Q1 text was in the main a memorial reconstruction made by an actor

---

1. Modern Language Review, Vol. X (1915), pp. 171-80.

who had played the part of Marcellus in a version of the play very close to that subsequently published in Q2. Gray did not visualise any transcript behind Q1. So "Marcellus" was brought in to account for the indubitable excellence of the reporting of the scenes in which he appears. But quite certainly Marcellus' written 'part' was not used in the preparation of the Q1 'copy'. Gray lists a considerable number of small errors in his speeches in that text,<sup>1</sup> which make it quite clear that in the scenes in which he appears we are dealing with exceptionally good reporting and nothing else.

I am of the opinion that Gray makes out a very good case for the complicity of the actor of the part of Marcellus in the memorial reconstruction; I agree that this actor may well have taken the part of the Player who acted Lucianus in the play-scene, since the speech corresponding to III ii 255-60 is excellently reported in Q1.

I am quite convinced that Dover Wilson is right in contending that Voltemar's written 'part' was used in the compilation of the Q1 text, and that the actor who played that part also appeared at the end of the play as one of the English ambassadors. I have some doubts, however, as to the probability that "Voltemar" was the same actor as "Marcellus". Does the fact that the

---

1. Modern Language Review, Vol. X, pp. 176-7 footnote.

'part' of Voltemar was available to the compiler(s) of the Q1 'copy' necessarily mean that the actor himself assisted in the memorial reconstruction? I should consider it extremely odd that if he did assist he should allow the name "Voltemar" to appear in the final stage-direction: he must have known himself that he was appearing there as an English ambassador.

Before proceeding to the next section, I would make one further point. If the 'copy' for Q1 was composite, and if both strata were memorially transmitted, it follows that metrical and structural irregularity is not by itself an adequate criterion of interpolation (as it was on Professor Dover Wilson's hypothesis). Before a good case can be made out for regarding a given passage as an interpolation, there must be actual evidence of textual dislocation resulting from the interpolator's interference.

THE Q1 PROBLEM

... (certainly) along with the ... of Q1 ... pointed out by ... (pp. xiv-xiv) and J. M. Robertson ... (pp. 15-17). See also ... (1923, pp. 94-100) and ... (1933). I give a ...

SECTION 3.

1. Q1 Dealing

ARE THERE TRACES OF AN EARLY HAMLET IN Q1?

---



Certain close parallels between Q1 and passages in the works of Kyd are pointed out by F. S. Boas (Works of Kyd, 1901, intro. pp. xlv-liv) and J. M. Robertson (The Problem of 'Hamlet', 1919, pp. 33-41). See also Gregor Sarrazin (Thomas Kyd und sein Kreis, 1892, pp. 94-122) and W. H. Widgery (Harness Prize Essay, 1880). I give a full list.

- (This play is not Kyd's, but is founded on his Comedy of Don Horatio: see Robertson, op. cit. p.34 note 2 and p. 53 ff., and also Boas, op. cit. intro. pp. xxxix-xliv).

- Isabella O where's the author of this endless woe?  
Hieronimo To know the author were some ease of grief,  
For woe begets woe, and grief hangs on grief.

3. Q1 (Queene) I will conceale, consent, and doe my best,  
What stratagem soe're thou shalt deuise.  
sc. xi.

cf. Spanish Tragedy, IV i 45:

Bellimperia Hieronimo, I will consent, conceal  
And aught that may effect for thine avail,  
Join with thee to revenge Horatio's death.  
Hieronimo On, then; and whatsoever I devise,  
Let me entreat you, grace my practices.

4. Q1 Therefore I will not drowne thee in my teares,  
sc. xv

cf. Spanish Tragedy, II v 23:

To drown thee with an ocean of my tears.

5. Q1 He might be once tasked for to try your cunning.  
sc. xv

cf. Spanish Tragedy, IV i 178:

You mean to try my cunning, then, Hieronimo.

6. Q1 Leartes And how for this?  
King Mary Leartes thus:....

Leartes T'is excellent,....

cf. Spanish Tragedy, IV i 74 ff.:

Lorenzo And how for that?

Hieronimo Marry, my good Lord, thus....

Lorenzo O excellent.....

7. Q1 Hamlet And if the king like not the tragedy,  
Why then belike he likes it not perdy.  
sc. ix

cf. Spanish Tragedy, IV i 196-7:

Hieronimo And if the world like not this Tragedy,  
Hard is the hap of old Hieronimo.

8. Q1 Hamlet I neuer gaue you cause..  
sc. xvi end.

cf. Spanish Tragedy, III xiv 148:

Lorenzo Hieronimo, I never gave you cause.

9. Q1 King ...wee'l haue Leartes, and our sonne,  
     Made friends and Louers, as befittes them both,  
   Sc. xvii

cf. Spanish Tragedy, III xiv 154:

Castile But here, before Prince Balthasar and me,  
     Embrace each other, and be perfect friends.

Boas points out the similarity of situation, and the fact that in both cases the reconciliation is the prelude to the catastrophe.

10. Q1 Leartes You haue preuailed, my Lord: a while Ile striue  
     To bury grief within a tombe of wrath  
   sc. xiii end.

cf. Spanish Tragedy, II iv 20:

Bellimperia Thou hast preuailed; I'll conquer my misdoubt  
     And in thy love and counsel drown my fear.

11. Q1 (Duke) Thou maist (perchance) haue a more noble mate  
   sc. ix (play-scene)

cf. Spanish Tragedy, II i 26:

I, but perhaps she hopes some nobler mate.

Boas notes also a few more general similarities: (i) the similarity between the Duke and Duchess's dialogue on the subject of second marriage in the play within the play in Q1 and Cornelia's self-reproaches for having taken a second husband (Cornelia, II, 31-54): (ii) that between the King's moralisings to Hamlet on the loss of fathers as a general law of nature in Q1 scene 2 and Cicero's similar reflections addressed to Cornelia (Cornelia, II,

214-6, 252-7): (iii) The king's outburst in the prayer-scene of Q1--

The earth doth still crie out vpon my fact,  
Pay me the murder of a brother and a king...

and The Murder of John Brewen (p. 287 lines 7-11 of the Boas ed.)

"Albeit there was none in the world to accuse Caine for as fowle a fact.....yet the blood of the iust Abel cried most shrill in the eares of the righteous God for vengeance, and reuenge on the murderer".

A few of these parallels are so vague that we may wonder whether anything is gained by citing them; in Boas's own words (op. cit. p. liii) "Elizabethan writers were fond of ringing the changes on a stock of current phrases, and..verbal coincidences here and there may be purely accidental". But admittedly some of the parallels are extraordinarily close. It is this very closeness which is the strongest argument against the interpretation put upon them by Boas and Robertson. "The series of parallels quoted" writes Boas (p. liii) "point to the survival in the First Quarto of traces of Kyd's play", i.e. the Ur-Hamlet. Robertson is even more emphatic:

To refuse to see in this string of verbal coincidences a proof of the survival of portions of Kyd's original text in Hamlet is to evade phenomena which can be explained in no other way.....If we are to suppose Shakespeare....composing a play of his own, we conceive him as parroting in the weakest way...his contemporaries who were incomparably his inferiors in literary power. A tag or a poetic trope he might and did echo from other poets, as they so constantly echoed each other; but here we have many phrases which are not current tags, and tropes not worth repeating. If Shakespeare penned them he was simply copying other men's humdrum dialogue, as if



for lack of power to make his own independently. The conception only needs to be put clearly in order to be rejected. The young Shakespeare was not more but less likely than other men to plagiarize thus weakly and slothfully.

(Problem of 'Hamlet', p. 41)

The passages from Hamlet quoted in the above list of parallels cannot, Robertson thinks, be by Shakespeare: they are close to Kyd: and as "in the parts of our play under notice there is no question of the intervention of any other hand" the evidence suggests that we have to do with survivals of the Kydian Hamlet. It should be noticed that Robertson cites two sets of parallels between Kyd and phrases in Hamlet not found in Q1 but only in the 'good' texts: these are,

- a. Importing Denmark's health and England's too (Hamlet V ii 21)  
 Importing health and wealth of Soliman (Soliman and Perseda,  
 V i 24).
- b. Hyperion's curls, the front of Jove himself (Hamlet III iv 56)  
 Fair locks resembling Phoebus' radiant beams,  
 Smooth forehead, like the table of high Jove.  
 (Soliman and Perseda, 333).

I cannot see that these two sets of parallels prove anything; there is no more than a general resemblance. Apart from them Robertson's citations are all from Q1 Hamlet: he assumes that it is Shakespeare's first revision of the old Kyd play, and says that there is no question of the intervention of any other hand than Kyd's and Shakespeare's. But he has not realised the nature of the transmission of the Q1 text, nor, consequently, the important bearing of that upon the inference to be drawn from those of the parallels which are close. There most certainly is

another hand to be reckoned with -- possibly more than one: the pirate's. And it is the very closeness of some of the parallels which makes infinitely more probable the hypothesis that in the process of memorial (or partially memorial) transmission, the pirate has confused similar situations in different plays. There are direct quotations from other Shakespeare plays in Q1, which will be found in my notes to that text: apparently, then, Shakespeare could plagiarize from himself -- write the same words in two different plays! If Boas and Robertson are right, we must suppose that Kyd wrote the same (or nearly the same) words at similar situations in different plays: this is surely absurd. And Boas goes so far as to impute to Kyd "inventive dramatic craftsmanship", while apparently holding at the same time that he duplicated himself in this extraordinary manner. This point need not be further laboured: Boas and Robertson have no case.

## II.

THE STORY OF HAMLET'S VOYAGE.

In support of the theory that Q1 represents (or misrepresents) a Hamlet play earlier than that found in Q2, it has been pointed out (e.g. by Widgery: Harness Prize Essay, 1880) that in the description of Hamlet's voyage Q1 contains a line not found in Q2 or F1, but present in Der Bestrafte Brudermord:

Being crossed by the contention of the windes,  
Q1 scene xiv line 5.

Nun begab es sich, dass wir eines Tages contrarien Wind  
hatten,.....

Brudermord, V ii: Cohn,  
p. 296.

No storm is mentioned in Q2 or F1; and the fight with the pirates is absent from both Q1 and the Brudermord. But a closer examination of all the versions shows that we cannot accept so simple a hypothesis as that Q1 here represents a version anterior to Q2 and F1.

Let us look at all three versions of Hamlet's adventure, i.e. (i) Brudermord, (ii) Q2 and F1, (iii) Q1.

- (i) In the Brudermord we find the events both represented (IV i: Cohn, pp. 285-8) and later described (V ii: Cohn, pp. 295-6). It should be noted that the description occurs in a scene between Hamlet and Horatio, as in Q2 and F1 V ii, not between Horatio and the Queen as in Q1 sc. xiv. Thus, although Q1 agrees with the Brudermord against Q2 and F1 in mentioning contrary winds, the

Brudermord agrees with Q2 and F1 against Q1 in placing the account in a Hamlet-Horatio scene, and Q1 is isolated. But discussion of this matter belongs to the section on the Brudermord. The story related in that version is as follows: Hamlet, accompanied by two ruffians, embarks for England; contrary winds force them to anchor by an island not far from Dover; Hamlet and his two attendants land in order to enjoy the fresh air; Hamlet proposes that the three of them should have a meal, whereupon the two ruffians inform him that they have orders from the king to take his life; Hamlet pleads with them, but they do not heed him: he tries to seize a sword from one of them, but is prevented; one of the assassins says to his fellow "You fire from this side, I from the other"; Hamlet resorts to trickery: he asks, as a last favour, that he be permitted to pray: when he is ready to die, he will raise his hands: they are to shoot simultaneously: the assassins agree to humour him: but when Hamlet raises his arms he falls forward, so that the two ruffians kill each other; Hamlet gives them the coup de grace with their own sword; then he searches them, and finds a letter from the king to an 'archhangman' (Erzmörder) in England, importing that, should the first attempt on Hamlet's life have miscarried, he is to be put to death forthwith. Hamlet resolves to return to Denmark; but, fearing that the captain of the ship may likewise be a rogue, he decides not to go by sea, but to go to the first "place" and take the post, ordering the sailors back to Denmark: "Ich will den ersten Platz suchen, und die Post nehmen; den Schiffer will ich nach



Dänemark wieder zurück commandieren" (Cohn, p. 287). This is a perfectly coherent account, except for one point at the end: Hamlet is to order the ship back to Denmark and go himself to the nearest post: but, as he is on an island, it is not clear how he is to get to the post-station. If we take the order of the clauses literally (i.e. (i) go to the first post-station (ii) send the ship back to Denmark without him and return himself by land) we may suppose that he means that he will go by sea only as far as the first place where he may get a post: but as his reason for travelling by land is fear of treachery from the captain, he must have had qualms about going even so far in the ship! - especially as he would return to it without his two companions. In this single particular the Brudermord account is defective: otherwise it is coherent, and quite independent of the version of the second quarto and the folio.

- (ii) Q2 and F1: Hamlet cannot sleep; suspicious of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, he goes up on deck, finds the 'packet' which they are bearing to the king of England, discovers the king's treachery, substitutes a new commission enjoining the execution of the bearers, and seals it with his father's signet which he has in his purse. Next day pirates attack the ship; during the fight, Hamlet boards their ship; just at that moment, the pirates get clear of the Danish ship, so that Hamlet alone becomes their prisoner. They treat him well, obtaining from him a promise that he will do them a good turn later. They set him

ashore in Denmark, and so he returns to the court. This is a perfectly coherent account of a story quite different from that in the Brudermord, though both versions have a written commission found by Hamlet in the possession of his treacherous attendants.

- (iii) The Q1 Version: It is quite obvious that no coherent account can be constructed from the material given in Q1 sc. xiv. Its story is as follows:-

Horatio Madame, your sonne is safe arriv'de in Denmarke,  
 This letter I euen now receiv'd of him,  
 Where as he writes how he escap't the danger,  
 And subtle treason that the king had plotted,  
 Being crossed by the contention of the windes,  
 He found the packet sent to the king of England,  
 Wherein he saw himselfe betray'd to death,  
 As at his next conuersion with your grace,  
 He will relate the circumstance at full.

The Queen comments on the King's treachery, and states that she will 'soothe and please him for a time' because 'murderous mindes are alwayes jealous': she asks Horatio where her son is, and he tells her that he has an appointment with him next morning 'on the east side of the Cittie': the Queen asks him to tell Hamlet to be careful: Horatio reassures her: the Queen asks what became of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern (Q1 Rossen-craft, Gilderstone): this is Horatio's reply:-

He being set ashore, they went for England,  
 And in the Packet there writ down that doome  
 To be perform'd on them poynted for him:  
 And by great chance he had his fathers Seale,  
 So all was done without discouerie.

Then the Queen takes her leave.

All that we are told of Hamlet's adventure, then, is that contrary winds beset the ship, that Hamlet found the 'packet' with his own death-warrant in it, that he was set ashore, that he had changed the commission and sealed it with his father's signet, and that his companions went on to their death. This story is riddled with gaps: we may pass over the impression conveyed by the text that 'the contention of the winds' and the finding of the packet were connected in some way not indicated; but there are other difficulties. Where was Hamlet set ashore? Why was he set ashore? How did he get back to Denmark? Rosen-crantz and Guildenstern were ordered by the king to take Hamlet to England; yet apparently they allow him to disembark at some unnamed place and go on without him, although the reason why they were going to England at all was to escort Hamlet. The extraordinarily defective nature of this account should dispose once and for all of the theory that in this scene we have unadulter<sup>at</sup>ed Ur-Hamlet.

The most important questions for us are, then, where and why was Hamlet set ashore, and how did he get back to Denmark. It is quite clear from Q1 that the voyage had started when the ship was 'crossed by the contention of the windes': for one thing, Horatio would not have said that Hamlet had arrived back in Denmark if his ship had been prevented by a storm from leaving port at all. Thus Hamlet was set ashore somewhere not in Denmark; and from there he has travelled back to Denmark. Surely the only explanation of these details is that they pre-

suppose the version of Hamlet's adventure which underlies the account of Der Bestrafte Brudermord: from this account two points are grasped by the person who constructed the Q1 version -- the contention of the winds, and Hamlet's going ashore: both are defective in accounting for Hamlet's return to Denmark, Q1 to a greater extent than the Brudermord.

But in other respects Q1 agrees with the account given in Q2 and the Folio. Hamlet finds the packet while still on the ship, alters it, and avoids discovery of the change by using his father's signet. These details are not part of the Brudermord version.<sup>1</sup>

It appears, then, that whoever constructed the Q1 version gave an incomplete and incoherent account of Hamlet's voyage, drawing details from two quite distinct versions of the story -- that underlying the German Hamlet and that underlying Shakespeare's final play. Thus what lies behind Q1 here is neither the Shakespearian or any pre-Shakespearian version; it is a confusion of two independent versions, the result of which confusion is an incomplete and thoroughly absurd story.<sup>2</sup> No clearer evidence could be found of the nature of the transmission of the Q1 text even at points where non-Shakespearian verse is present.

I do not think that this matter has previously been dealt

1. Note that in Q1 Horatio receives tidings of Hamlet's adventures in a letter, just as in Q2 and F1 (IV vii): there is no such letter in the Brudermord.

2. Yet Widgey held that Q1 represents Shakespeare's 'first sketch'!



with by any critic: but I can quote A. Clutton-Brock's general verdict on Q1, with which the above analysis agrees: he says that Q1

seems to consist partly of Shakespeare's work garbled and partly of fragments of the older play....There is no reason to suppose that it gives us a version of the play which was at any time Shakespeare's own version. It seems rather a hotch-potch of Shakespeare and the older play, put together perhaps by some one who got Shakespeare's part of it fur-  
tively as well as imperfectly.

(Shakespeare's Hamlet, p. 11)

I believe this explanation of Q1 to be the true one. There is one further point: to suppose that the account of Hamlet's voyage which underlies the slightly defective one of the Brudermord is that of the Ur-Hamlet would be the natural thing to do; but it is, of course, extremely dangerous to draw in-  
ferences from that curious text as to the nature of the lost play. If certain details in the Q1 account of this episode do represent the Ur-Hamlet we can add that the person who put the Q1 text together has got it imperfectly in addition to getting Shakespeare imperfectly. But all that we can claim as toler-  
ably certain is that here in Q1 two separate accounts of an episode are thoroughly confused, one of these being Shakespeare's and the other that underlying Der Bestrafte Brudermord.

## III.

THE CHARACTER OF THE QUEEN.

Another argument used to support the theory that Q1 represents a version of the play anterior to that of Q2 is based on differences in characterisation between Q1 on the one hand and Q2 and F1 on the other: the most striking of these differences is in the character of the Queen. Thus Herford (Harness Prize Essay, 1880) and Furnivall (intro. to Griggs facsimile of Hamlet Q1) use this difference as part of the evidence that Q1 represents Shakespeare's first draft of the play; and Robertson (Problem of 'Hamlet', p. 73) thinks that the Gertrude of Q1 is the Gertrude of Kyd's play.

The main difference is that in Q1 the Queen explicitly denies any knowledge of the murder of her first husband before Hamlet's revelation of it to her; there is no such explicit denial in Q2 or F1. In Q1 she offers direct assistance to her son in whatever plan he shall form for revenge; in Q2 and F1 she does not. And in the scene peculiar to Q1, that between her and Horatio (sc. xiv), she implies that she will 'soothe and please' the murderer for a while -- presumably to lull his suspicions and thus help Hamlet to surprise him. In that scene she outspokenly condemns the King's treachery, and lines herself up with Hamlet and Horatio against the King much more unequivocally than Q2 or F1 give us any warrant for supposing.

We must discover (a) how great the difference really is, and (b) whether any difference there may be is necessarily to be attributed to the cause advanced by Herford and Furnivall or Robertson.

Herford talks of 'the veil' which in Q2 is studiously drawn over Gertrude, concealing 'the precise measure of her complicity in the murder': Furnivall quotes this approvingly. Granting that in Q2 she does not explicitly deny knowledge of the crime, I cannot see that Shakespeare leaves her total innocence in doubt. Bradley's analysis of the Gertrude of Q2 is extremely acute:

....she was not privy to the murder of her husband, either before the deed or after it. There is no sign of her being so, and there are clear signs that she was not. The representation of the murder in the play-scene does not move her; and when her husband starts from his throne, she innocently asks him, 'How fares my lord?' In the interview with Hamlet, when her son says of his slaughter of Polonius,

"A bloody deed!" Almost as bad, good mother,

As kill a king and marry with his brother,  
the astonishment of her repetition 'As kill a king!' is evidently genuine; and, if it had not been so, she would never have had the hardihood to exclaim:

What have I done, that thou darrest wag thy tongue

In noise so rude against me?

Further, it is most significant that when she and the King speak together alone, nothing that is said by her or to her implies her knowledge of the secret.

(Shakespearean Tragedy, p.166)

Dover Wilson re-emphasises these points (What Happens in Hamlet, pp. 248, 252-3), noting also that before the play-scene Gertrude and Claudius are alone together for only an instant; the dialogue runs:

King. He (i.e. Polonius) tells me, my dear Gertrude, he  
   hath found  
           The head and source of all your son's distemper.  
Queen I doubt it is no other but the main,  
           His father's death and our o'erhasty marriage.  
King. Well, we shall sift him.

(II ii 54-8)

Of Gertrude's speech Dover Wilson writes (p.252) "She would surely not have phrased the matter thus had she entertained any suspicion at all of the real facts". I agree: here if anywhere her innocence is as clear as could be.

Thus in making the Queen explicitly deny her knowledge of the murder the transmitter of the Q1 text is only putting more directly and crudely what is implicit in Q2; Q1 is a pirated text, and whatever the manner of its transmission there is room for adulteration by the reporter or reporters. So it is not necessary to suppose that the Queen's explicit denial ever stood in any Hamlet play. And when we find that it is embedded in a passage which is full of indications of memorial reconstruction, our suspicion of its value as evidence of Q1's dependence on an earlier Hamlet than that of Q2 is increased. After Hamlet has directed his mother's attention to the Ghost stealing 'out of the Portall' in the bedroom-scene, we have the following dialogue:

<u>Queene</u>	Alas, it is the weaknesse of thy braine,	1
	Which makes thy tongue to blazon thy hearts griefe:	
	But as I haue a soule I sweare by heauen,	
	I neuer knew of this most horride murder:	
	But Hamlet, this is onely fantasie,	5
	And for my loue forget these idle fits.	
<u>Ham.</u>	Idle, no mother, my pulse doth beate like yours,	
	It is not madnesse that possesseth Hamlet.	
	O mother, if euer you did my deare father loue,	
	Forbeare the adulterous bed to night, etc.	10



This passage occurs immediately after the Ghost's exit: and there are reminiscences of the Ghost's speech to Hamlet at I v 9 seq. Two Ghost-scenes are mixed up in Q1. With lines 2 and 9 of the above extract from Q1 cf. I v 21-3:

But this eternal blazon must not be  
To ears of flesh and blood. List, list, O list!  
If thou didst ever thy dear father love --

This is reproduced in Q1 as:

But this same blazon must not be, to eares of flesh and blood  
Hamlet, if euer thou didst thy deere father loue...

Note that in the Q1 bedroom scene it is the Q1 form of this last line which is caught up -- consider (i) the relative positions of 'thou didst' and 'ever', and (ii) the prefixed vocative (Hamlet -- O mother). The line is carefully adapted to its new context in the bedroom-scene by the change of pronouns.

With line 5 of the above extract from the Q1 bedroom-scene cf. also the first act -- this time I i 23 (Horatio says 'tis but our fantasy) and 53-4 (How now Horatio,....Is this not something more than fantasy?). Again note the similarity of situation: Horatio is sceptical of the Ghost's existence, just as the Queen is later. Note also the similarity of construction in (i) "'tis but...fantasy", and (ii) "this is onely fantasie".

With line 6 of the extract cf. III ii 88, where Hamlet, referring to his assumed madness, says to Horatio "I must be idle" (i.e. crazy). Again, at IV i 8 the Queen herself, referring to Hamlet's killing of Polonius, talks of his "lawless fit": and further on, in the graveyard, condoning Hamlet's ranting to Laertes, she says:

This is mere madness,  
And thus a while the fit will work on him.  
(V i 278-9)

At neither of these points does 'fit' occur in Q1, but it appears here in the bedroom-scene in a similar sense. Thus the Q1 lines

But Hamlet, this is onely fantasie,  
And for my loue forget these idle fits.

seems to have been manufactured out of reminiscences of three distinct passages -- the first line from I i 23, idle from III ii 88, and fits from IV i 8 or V i 279.

Finally, take lines 1 and 8 of the passage quoted from the Q1 bedroom scene: taken together, they recall two adjacent lines in Q1 scene 6 (not found in the 'good' texts):-

And so by continuance and weaknesse of the braine  
Into this frensie, which now possesseth him.

(Corambis' description of Hamlet's  
madness; Q1 sc. vi, lines 93-4).

The corresponding passage in the 'good' texts (i.e. II ii 146 ff.) runs:

And he repelled...fell...into a weakness...and into  
the madness wherein now he raves.

A loose recollection of this, worked up by the reporter (or by Professor H. D. Gray's hack-poet), would account for the Q1 version; and a recollection of that version would account for the extremely close parallel in the same text's version of the bedroom-scene.

Thus two points have emerged: (1) that there is no doubt in the 'good' texts of the Queen's ignorance of the murder of

the elder Hamlet: (2) that the explicit denial, from her own lips, which is found in Q1 may be only the result of a crude over-emphasis and over-simplification of Shakespeare's subtler nuances of characterisation, this being rendered quite likely by the fact that the denial is embedded in a passage which is obviously the result of imperfect memorial reconstruction<sup>1</sup> and never stood in any Hamlet play.

At the end of the bedroom scene in Q1 the Queen offers Hamlet her active help in his duty of revenge:

Hamlet, I vow by that maiesty,  
That knowes our thoughts, and lookes into our hearts,  
I will conceale, consent, and doe my best,  
What stratagem soe're thou shalt devise.

As has already been noted, the last two lines are the words not of Gertrude but of Belimperia (Spanish Tragedy, IV i 45 ff.). The piratical transmitter of the Q1 text has mixed up the two characters. As this is an importation from another play, we are entitled to claim that no inference can be drawn from it as regards the character of Gertrude. Robertson thinks that it is a trace of the Kydian Hamlet (Problem of Hamlet, p. 73): on the contrary it is no more than a trace of the Spanish Tragedy, which has been confused with Hamlet by a pirate.

---

1. Cf. What Happens in Hamlet, p. 253: the Queen's innocence is certainly more patent in Q1 and the Brudermord: "But this is only because Shakespeare is subtler than his perverters or his predecessors". The above argument conduces to the view that those responsible, at any rate in the case of Q1, are his perverters.

These are the arguments which could be used against the position that the Gertrude of the 1st Quarto is the Gertrude of either the Ur-Hamlet or a Shakespearian first sketch. Are there arguments which could be used to maintain that position?

Robertson is wrong when he maintains that the presence of quotations from Kyd's works in Q1 Hamlet indicates traces of the Kydian Ur-Hamlet. But he has one very powerful argument for his position with regard to the character of Gertrude: in The Problem of Hamlet, p. 73, he points out that in those respects in which Q1 differs here from Q2 and F1, it agrees with Belleforest. Accordingly, we must examine Belleforest's account of the interview between Hamlet and his mother, and compare it with Q1 and with the 'good' texts.

After Amleth's attack on his mother in Belleforest, she replies with an admission that she did wrong in marrying Fengon (corresponding to Claudius); but she did have a certain amount of justification, for the courtiers are all loyal to Fengon, and he had overwhelming power to turn against her if she resisted him. So Amleth should excuse her fault, rather than condemn her for licentiousness:

...quand tu considereras le peu de moyen de resistance.... tu m'excuseras plustost que accuser de lubricité, ny d'inconstance, et moins me feras ce tort que de soupçonner que jamais Geruthe ait consenty à la mort de son espoux, te jurant par la haute majesté des Dieux, que s'il eust este en ma puissance de resister au tyran, et qu'avec l'effusion de mon sang, et perte de ma vie, j'eusse peu sauver la vie de mon seigneur et espoux, je l'eusse fait d'aussi bon coeur, comme depuis j'ay plusieurs fois donné empeschement à l'accourcissement de la tienne, laquelle t'estant ravie, je ne veux plus demeurer en ce monde, puis que l'esprit estant sain, je voy les moyens plus aysez de la vengeance de ton pere. Toutes-fois, mon filz, et doux amy, si tu as pitié de toy, et soin



de la memoire de ton pere: et si tu veux rien faire pour celle qui ne merite point le nom de mere en ton endroict, je te prie de conduire sagement tes affaires, n'estre hasté, ny trop boüillant en tes entreprinses, ny t'avancer plus que de raison à l'effect de ton dessein.

(Gollancz, Sources of Hamlet, pp.220-2)

She goes on to say that they have none whom they can trust: every one at the court is a potential spy for Fengon, who himself dissembles, pretending to love Amleth so that he may continue to have his pleasure of her (Geruth): he suspects that Amleth is not really mad, so if the latter should do anything which smacked of wisdom Fengon will be informed: Geruth is afraid that already he has been told of what has passed between them in this very interview: Amleth's killing of the observer may be the undoing of them both, but for her part she will keep it secret as well as his sanity,

priant les Dieux (mon fils) que guidans ton coeur,  
dressans tes conseils, et bien heurans ton entreprise,  
je te voye jouyssant des biens qui te sont deuz, et de  
la couronne de Dannemarch, que le tyran t'a ravie....

She will rejoice in the courage and boldness with which her son will take vengeance on the murderer of his father and upon those who have assisted him.

In Belleforest, then, as in Q1, Hamlet's mother explicitly denies knowledge of the murder before Hamlet's disclosure of it, and promises him active support in his duty of revenge. But this is not all: observe how some of the words used by the Queen to Horatio in that scene peculiar to Q1 (sc. xiv) are closely paralleled in Belleforest. Compare Q1 scene xiv lines 19-21, where Gertrude says to Horatio

...bid him a while  
 Be wary of his presence, lest that he  
 Faile in that he goes about....

with Geruthe's words to Amleth which have been already quoted:

je te prie de conduire sagement tes affaires, n'estre  
 hasté, ny trop boüillant en tes entreprises, ny t'avancer  
 plus que de raison à l'effect de ton dessein.

(Gollancz, p. 222).

These two extracts are obviously connected: indeed it is from Belleforest's account that we discover the exact reason why Gertrude fears that Hamlet may fail if he is not wary -- all the courtiers are on the tyrant's side and will report suspicious actions to him. This close verbal parallelism which we have discovered is important: a passage in Q1, not paralleled in the 'good' texts, is rooted in Belleforest. And one more small point here: at the end of the Q1 version of the bedroom-scene, just before the introduction of the quotation from Kyd ('I will conceale, consent, etc.') the Queen says

Hamlet, I vow by that maiesty  
 That knowes our thoughts, etc.

And in Belleforest, in her speech to Amleth in the corresponding situation, Geruthe, having denied complicity in the murder of his father, continues, "jurant par la haute majesté des Dieux" that had it been in her power she would have saved her husband's life.

We have in Q1, then, a fragment or two of material, connected with the characterisation of the Queen, which certainly seem to be based, not on the version of the 2nd Quarto or the Folio, but upon the prose source. Now it would not do to spring

immediately to the conclusion that this fragment or two is a trace of the old play -- that mentioned by Nashe in 1589, by whatever author. It might perfectly legitimately be argued that the compiler of Q1, his memory failing, had recourse to Belleforest to help him out<sup>1</sup> (this presupposes that he knew French, since the English translation was not published till 1608). I do not say that I think this likely; but, if we have indeed discovered a trace of the Ur-Hamlet in Q1, it does not mean that we must subscribe to the belief that behind Q1 lies a version of the play anterior to that presented by Q2: as in the case of Hamlet's voyage, it is most probable that we are dealing with a momentary confusion between two distinct versions of the play: this is surely quite as possible as a momentary confusion between different plays, a phenomenon of which we find many examples in pirated texts. Most of the 1st quarto text clearly represents the play substantially as found in Q2; only here and there we come across possible traces of an older play (or at any rate another Hamlet). The theory of momentary confusion is much the safest to adopt. A comparison of the Q1 and Q2 or F1 versions of the bedroom-scene, for example, cannot fail to yield the conclusion that what those responsible were trying to reconstruct was substantially the final Shakespearian version: yet embedded in that reconstruction we have found what may be a passing trace of another play, or at least another version of the story. And not only are two separate versions of the Hamlet story confused as regards the Queen, but because of that confusion she is also confused with Belimperia (who resembles Geruthe quite closely) and given words to say which properly belong to Kyd's heroine.

## IV.

THE POSITION OF THE NUNNERY SCENE.

There is an interesting difference in the order of the episodes between Q1 and the 'good' editions: in the former the meeting between Hamlet and Ofelia (preceded by the "To be or not to be" soliloquy) occurs immediately after it is planned by Corambis and the King; in the latter the formation and execution of the plan are separated by a number of episodes -- viz. the 'fishmonger' dialogue (II ii 168-222); Hamlet's meeting with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern (ibid. 223-383), during which they mention the arrival of the players; Polonius' announcement of the players' arrival and the 'Jephtha' dialogue (ibid 384-425) Hamlet's conversation with the players, including the 'Pyrrhus' speech (ibid. 426-551); the 'rogue and peasant slave' soliloquy (ibid. 552-609); Rosencrantz' and Guildenstern's report to the king and queen about Hamlet's mental condition and their inability to probe it to its roots (III i 1-28). All these episodes are represented in Q1, and in that order, but after the "To be or not to be" soliloquy and the nunnery-scene.

Gustav Tanger (Transactions of the New Shakspeare Society, 1880-2, Part I pp. 172-4), maintaining that Q1 represents (very imperfectly) the play as contained in Q2, attributes this structural alteration to the pirate's carelessness. Compare the two versions of Corambis-Polonius's plan:

Q2: Pol. You know sometimes he walks four hours together  
       Here in the lobby.  
Queen. So he does, indeed.



Pol. At such a time I'll loose my daughter to him.

Be you and I behind an arras then,  
Mark the encounter, if he love her not,  
And be not from his reason fall'n thereon,  
Let me be no assistant for a state,  
But keep a farm and carters.

King. We will try it.  
(II ii 160-7)

Q1: (Cor.) The Princes walke is here in the galery,  
There let Ofelia walke vntill hee comes:  
Your selfe and I will stand close in the study,  
There shall you heare the effect of all his hart,  
And if it proue any otherwise then loue,  
Then let my censure faile an other time.

The Q1 version is, according to Tanger, a clumsy attempt at rendering that of Q2: but the pirate has made some mistakes, which get him into trouble. The Q1 lines do not express, as do those of Q2,

that the Prince walks only sometimes in the gallery, but "The Princes walke is here in the gallery", i.e. he walks there regularly. They do not say that Polonius is going to "loose his daughter to him 'at such a time'", but they show Corambis's intention of carrying out his design without delay:

There let Ofelia walke vntill he comes.  
X (the pirate) was thus driven into a corner by his own improvidence, and had to transpose, or rather insert, the scene in question (together with a portion of the dialogue between the King and Corambis consequent upon it), so as to make it follow immediately after Corambis's proposal.

(Tanger, op. cit. p.173)

There are two powerful objections against this explanation, which is far too simple: and Tanger is aware of both, though not of their force. He points out (p. 172) that Grant White was in error in supposing that Ofelia was not on the stage in Q1 when she was wanted for the meeting with Hamlet. Actually her entry is provided for in Q1 at the point corresponding to II ii 39 of the 'good' texts, although she is utterly ignored

for no less than 96 lines, until her father says "And here Ofelia reade you on this booke, / And walke aloofe". The only reason for Ofelia's entry at the point corresponding to II ii 39 is to have her ready here for her meeting with Hamlet. Thus the pirate's misrepresentation of II ii 160-7 cannot have been the precipitating cause of the structural alteration, which is prepared for carefully about a hundred lines before - unless the pirate went back and inserted Ofelia's name in the stage direction in question after he was forced (by his own 'improvidence'!) into making the change in sequence. And that this did not happen there is fairly clear evidence, which will be dealt with in a moment. The second objection is the extraordinarily careful adaptation of the text to the new sequence which Tanger supposes his pirate to have effected: it is hardly reasonable to hold that a person who "drives himself into a corner by his own improvidence" will have the great skill necessary to make the adaptation which Tanger analyses.

Now this matter is far from simple: I agree with Tanger that certain features of the Q1 text indicate the probability that someone has carefully adapted a representation of what is substantially the Q2 text in order to make it fit a different scene-sequence. Consider the dialogue between the King and Polonius which follows the nunnery-scene in Q2 and F1: I quote from the New Cambridge Hamlet, III i 165-end:

The King and Polonius steal forth from behind the arras  
King. Love! his affections do not that way tend,  
 Nor what he spake, though it lacked form a little,

Was not like madness -- there's something in his soul,  
 O'er which his melancholy sits on brood,  
 And I do doubt the hatch and the disclose  
 Will be some danger; which for to prevent,  
 I have in quick determination  
 Thus set it down: he shall with speed to England,  
 For the demand of our neglected tribute.  
 Haply the seas, and countries different,  
 With variable objects, shall expel  
 This something-settled matter in his heart,  
 Whereon his brains still beating puts him thus  
 From fashion of himself. What think you on't?

(Ophelia comes forward.)

Polonius. It shall do well. But yet I do believe  
 The origin and commencement of his grief  
 Sprung from neglected love. How now, Ophelia?  
 You need not tell us what Lord Hamlet said,  
 We heard it all. My lord, do as you please,  
 But if you hold it fit, after the play,  
 Let his queen-mother all alone entreat him  
 To show his grief, let her be round with him,  
 And I'll be placed (so please you) in the ear  
 Of all their conference. If she find him not,  
 To England send him; or confine him where  
 Your wisdom best shall think.

King It shall be so,  
 Madness in great ones must not unwatched go.  
 (they depart)

Now, whoever adapted the Q1 text to its sequence has very cleverly separated certain portions of the above dialogue: after the Q1 nunnery-scene we have:

King. Loue? No, no, that's not the cause,  
 Some deeper thing it is that troubles him.  
Cor. Wel, something it is: my Lord, content you a while,  
 I will my selfe goe feel him: let me worke,  
 Ile try him euery way: see where he comes,  
 Send you those Gentlemen, let me alone,  
 To find the depth of this, away, be gone.

This is followed by the 'fishmonger' dialogue. The link between the nunnery-scene and the fishmonger-dialogue is skilfully manufactured: a link was necessary, and, as Tanger points out, the transmitter of the Q1 text has taken a fragment of the dialogue between the King and Polonius quoted in full above and lumped

it together with some lines of his own (i.e. Corambis's lines) to effect a suitable link. What Tanger calls the pirate's own lines give a good enough explanation of why Corambis should 'board' Hamlet immediately after his meeting with Ofelia.

Here I would add just one possibility (it is no more than that): of the above seven lines from Q1 the first two are unquestionably derived from III i 165-8 of the full text. Now take Corambis's five-line speech: it will be noticed that he repeats himself -- after "see where he comes" he says pretty much what he has already said before these words. And there is an interesting bibliographical peculiarity about his first three lines: each has a medial colon. Now it can be truthfully said that the punctuation of Q1 is generally fairly light: colons occur, but generally at the ends of lines, and not often in close proximity. And to have three colons in the middle of three successive lines is a rarity -- I can find only one other example of such a phenomenon, not very far away from this one: Corambis, telling the King and Queen about Hamlet's love-affair with his daughter, says in response to the Queen's request to him to be brief:-

Madam I will: my Lord, I haue a daughter,  
Haue while shee's mine: for that we thinke  
Is surest, we often loose: now to the Prince.  
My Lord, but note this letter,  
The which my daughter in obedience  
Deliuer'd to my handes.

This is a very curious speech, occurring as it does in a context which is tolerably metrical. It might be suggested that it contains an interpolation such as those we discussed in the first



section of this study. The original stratum may have read thus:-

Queene Good my Lord be briefe.

Cor. Madam I will(.) My Lord, but note this letter,  
The which my daughter in obedience  
Deliuier'd to my handes.

King

Reade it my Lord.

The hand which wrote this was that of a person who did not appreciate Corambis-Polonius's idea of brevity: and a second hand, with little metrical power, has supplemented him. I think that this is rendered a possible view by the coincidence of two factors, viz. (i) the fact that the "interpolation" is structurally irregular in a fairly regular context, and (ii) the fact that the punctuation is, with the exception of one passage, unique in Q1. The lines in question would seem to have been written in by someone who was prone to use colons in quick succession, even in the middle of lines. He may even have added the first of the three colons just before his interpolation (i.e. after the word "will"). Now we have seen that at the end of the Q1 nunnery-scene we have again three colons in the middle of three adjacent lines: can we see the same editing hand at work here also? Is it not at least possible that the original stratum of the Q1 'copy' ran simply thus:

King. Loue? No, no, that's not the cause,  
Some deeper thing it is that troubles him.

Cor. See where he comes.

Send you those gentlemen. let me alone,  
To find the depth of this, away, begone.

Even this furnishes a link between the nunnery-scene and the fishmonger dialogue, but it is rather abrupt. Is it not possible

that a reviser of this portion of the Q1 'copy', noticing the abruptness, botched up three lines and inserted them (using his very heavy punctuation), so as to furnish a better link to fit the altered sequence in Q1? If so, he has in this case managed to produce three metrical enough lines.

But to return to Q1's treatment of III i 165-end in Q2: part of it, as we have seen, is placed after the Q1 nunnery-scene and forms a portion of an ingenious link between that scene and the fishmonger episode: part of it, however, is retained just before the scene where Hamlet gives instructions to the players (Q2 III ii, Q1 sc. ix):

Madam, send you in haste to speake with him,  
And I my selfe will stand behind the Arras,  
There question you the cause of all his griefe.  
And then in loue and nature vnto you, hee'lle tell you all:  
etc.

Thus the current of the Q2 sequence is rejoined here.

Tanger thought that the alteration of sequence in Q1 was made necessary by the pirate's incompetence, but proceeded to credit the same pirate with the skill necessary to make these adjustments. William Poel (see Athenaeum, 1900, p. 316 and Notes and Queries, series 12 vol. xi (1922) pp. 301-3) maintained that behind Q1 lay a careful stage-adaptation of the playhouse copy which later became the basis of F1. He visualised a very practical purpose for the structural alteration which we are considering: by the time the nunnery-scene comes along in the full version an ordinary audience may well have forgotten Polonius's plan and may therefore fail to understand what is in

any case a difficult scene. It is certainly better to attribute the adaptation which we have just examined to a professional stage-adaptor or man of the theatre than to a pirate whom at the same time you label as inept.

Both Tanger and Poel ignore the inconsistency present in the text of II i in both Q2 and F1. Ophelia enters in high agitation to tell her father of Hamlet's queer behaviour in her boudoir; Polonius immediately takes this as a proof of his theory that Hamlet's madness springs from 'the very ecstasy of love', and determines that the King shall hear of it at once. "I will go seek the king", he says at line 98: "come, go we to the king" at line 114. This latter direction is inconsistent with the subsequent action, for at II ii 39 it is Polonius alone who enters. In Q1 on the other hand it is the first remark which is caught up (as 'Lets to the King'), and accordingly, as we have seen, both Corambis and Ofelia enter at the point corresponding to II ii 39, though Ofelia is ignored for 96 lines. Chambers (William Shakespeare, Vol 1, p. 417), also holding that the Q1 sequence is an alteration of that in Q2 and F1, suggests as a possible reason for the structural change that "it was an attempt to remove an original inconsistency, characteristic enough of Shakespeare, by which Ophelia is bidden to accompany her father to the King in II i, but left out in II ii". He apparently believes that the inconsistency was the result merely of momentary carelessness on Shakespeare's part. This may be: but it is at least reasonable to hold that it indicates careless

revision. This is the view taken by E. E. Stoll (Modern Philology, vol. 35 (1937-8) pp. 31 ff.) and H. Granville Barker (Prefaces to Shakespeare, 3rd series, Hamlet: pp. 194-200). According to this view, we have in Q2 and F1 a revision of a version in which the planning of the Hamlet-Ophelia meeting and the execution of that plan were contiguous: Shakespeare has separated them, but has accidentally left in his text a trace of the older arrangement ("come, go we to the king"). Stoll considers this a trace of the Kyd stage of the play's history, Granville Barker tends rather to attribute it to a Shakespearian version anterior to that of Q2.

We can on the evidence of II i in the 'good' texts consider it possible that in juxtaposing the planning of the "Ophelia test" and the test itself Q1 follows a version of the play anterior to that presented in Q2: but the indications that what underlies Q1 is substantially the text found in Q2 and that that has been carefully adapted to fit the said juxtaposition seem to me very strong. All that we can hazard as regards the hypothetical earlier version is that these two scenes were contiguous: we do not know that that version contained all that Q1 presents. It seems to me most reasonable to adopt a view stated but not finally accepted by Granville Barker (op. cit. p. 198), viz. that the dialogue throughout the portion of Q1 under discussion (i.e. from the planning of the nunnery-scene to the planning of the bedroom-scene) represents that of the version underlying Q2 but that the juxtaposition of the arrangement for the



nunnery-scene and that scene itself is that of an earlier version. Then this hypothesis follows: Shakespeare left in his final text a trace of the old juxtaposition; this was caught up by the transmitter(s) of the Q1 text: therefore Ofelia was brought on with her father at the point corresponding to II ii 39: therefore the nunnery-scene had to follow its planning, as in the earlier play: but it was the full Q2 text which the transmitters of Q1 were trying to reproduce: therefore they did their best by adapting that text to their sequence. I confess that I am not over-much in love with this hypothesis, but I can see no more probable alternative which takes all factors into account. I would willingly accept Poel's theory were it not that he ignores the fact that the Q1 scene-sequence is in part reversion.

## V.

THE NAME "CORAMBIS".

Throughout the 1st Quarto the name "Corambis" is found instead of Polonius. In the scene corresponding to II i 1-71 the name "Montano" is found for the Reynaldo of the 'good' texts. In Der Bestrafte Brudermord the counsellor is called Corambus; Montano-Reynaldo does not appear in that version. The name "Corambus" occurs in All's Well that Ends Well: and it seems probable that the suffix -is of Q1 Hamlet is an error.

Critics who maintain that Q1 owes nothing to any version of the play earlier than that given in Q2 are placed in rather a difficult position by these two names peculiar to Q1. Tanger (Transac. New Shak. Soc. 1880-2, Pt. I, pp. 156-9) states that the name Polonius occurs only four times in the received text: actually it occurs five times.<sup>1</sup> Tanger holds that at each of these places the pirate (taking notes in the theatre) missed what was said on the stage; he either omits the sentences containing the name Polonius or, having only brief disconnected notes, writes them up "rather independently".

.....X (i.e. the pirate), in the hurry of taking down his notes, failed to hear the name of Polonius distinctly enough to note it down in its correct form. If we consider that to X, Polonius must have seemed a subordinate character as compared with Hamlet, Ophelia, the King, the Queen, and Horatio, and that we meet with partial distortions in the names of Gilderstone, Rossencraft, Voltemar, and Cornelia, and Leartes; that the name of Ostrick, -- (which occurs twice in the text of Q2 (V ii 186 and 246) and once only in that of F1, the former passage (the

---

1. At I ii 57, IV i 34, IV iii 17 and 34, IV v 83.

dialogue with the Lord) not being represented on the stage,) -- is entirely wanting in Q1; that in like manner the name of Francisco, which also occurs only once in the opening of the piece, has not been caught by X, we may safely infer that Corambis is nothing but a distortion of the true name of Polonius. And indeed at some distance from the stage, X could easily misunderstand Corambis for Polonius, especially as he was busy taking down his notes. Observe that both words are trisyllabic, that both have an 'o' in the first syllable, followed by a liquid consonant, that both accent the second syllable containing a nasal consonant, and that both names have an 's' for their final consonant.

(Tanger, op. cit. pp. 157-8)

Quite apart from the conviction that we have to deal not with a note-taker in the theatre but with memorial reconstruction, I find this completely unconvincing. I cannot think it possible that "Corambis" or "Corambus" is a mishearing of "Polonius": despite the technical similarities noted by Tanger the two words sound completely different, and I think that Daniel, Nicholson, Ingleby, and Furnivall were justified in their scepticism (see Tanger, op. cit. p. 158 footnote 2). I cannot avoid the conclusion that the name "Corambis" is a trace of a version of the play earlier than that given in Q2 or F1. Even H. D. Gray, who is disposed to find as little as possible in Q1 of a play earlier than the acting version of Shakespeare's final drama, admits that it is probable that Shakespeare substituted "Polonius" for the "Corambis" of an earlier version.<sup>1</sup>

Throughout Q1, however, the speeches of Corambis are quite close to those of the authentic editions. I can find no

---

1. See H. D. Gray, The First Quarto 'Hamlet', M. L. R. vol. X, (1915) pp. 171 seq.

discrepancies which cannot reasonably be accounted for as per-versions made in the course of imperfect memorial transmission. The words represent the words of Polonius: only the name is different. Once again we seem to have patchwork in Q1 -- the words of the final Shakespearian version, the name of an earlier version.

In his introduction to the Griggs facsimile of Q2 Furnivall suggests that in the revision of his first sketch Shakespeare changed 'Corambis' to 'Polonius' simply because he fancied a change of name. But two suggestions of specific motives for the alteration have been made.

1. There is an important essay on this subject by Israel Gollancz in A Book of Homage to Shakespeare, 1916.<sup>1</sup> He holds that the name 'Corambus' was the creation of the author of the pre-Shakespearian Hamlet who cleverly re-Latinized "crambe" (with its popular variant Crambo) used in contemporary English for twice-cooked cabbage, i.e. tedious and unpleasant iteration, with reference to the Latin phrase Crambe repetita (cp. *Occidit miseros crambe repetita magistros*). 'Corambe' and variants are found in Latin-English dictionaries of the period. 'Corambis' or 'Corambus', therefore, was merely, as it were, 'old Crambo', an excellent name for the inherent characteristic of the Counsellor, who in

---

1. pp. 173-7. See also Proceedings of the British Academy, 1903-4: summary of paper delivered by Gollancz on "Shakespeariana, 1598-1602" on April 27th, 1904.



the original of the story, as told by Saxo Grammaticus in the Danish History, had exalted ideas of his own profound astuteness, for which he paid the heavy penalty." (op. cit. p.173)

Gollancz goes on to conjecture that "the possibilities of the character were effectively developed by the earlier dramatist" and that possibly "the character was so set forth as to portray some marked characteristics of Elizabeth's aged counsellor, the great statesman Burleigh, for whom contemporary men of letters had but scant reverence". Burleigh died in 1598, and his son Robert Cecil became one of the most important men in England. "We may certainly assume," says Gollancz, "that the change of the name from 'Corambis' to 'Polonius' was made by Shakespeare soon after 1598 when he was still transforming the older play; and that he was anxious to make it clear that his Counsellor... ..was not to be associated in the public mind with the earlier caricature of the great statesman who had gone to rest" (op. cit. p.174).<sup>1</sup>

- 
1. Gollancz suggests a derivation for the name Polonius. He refers to a manual for counsellors, popular in England at the end of the 16th century, by the great Polish statesman Laurentius Grimalius Goslicius, Bishop of Posen (pub. Venice 1568). An English version appeared in 1598, the year of Burleigh's death. On the title-page it is "consecrated to the honour of the Polonian Empire". "We may feel sure" says Gollancz (p. 175) "that it was this translation that Shakespeare looked into, and, to the honour of the 'Polonian' name, dubbed the counsellor of the King of Denmark by a name which could only mean the Polonian, or the Pole". Gollancz produces evidence of the popularity of the work in England; and points to suggestive parallels in it to the words and character of Polonius and to the speech 'What a piece of work is a man'.

2. A most interesting suggestion is made by H. D. Gray in an article entitled "The Roles of William Kemp" in the Modern Language Review, vol. XXV (1930), pp. 261-73. Kemp had begun his career with such merriments as are featured on the title-page of A Knack to Know a Knave:<sup>1</sup> this play contains little scope in the dialogue for a comedian, so probably Kemp relied on his ability to improvise. We know that one of his favourite tricks was to take off his slipper and throw it at some other actor. We know from a stage-direction in Q2 Romeo that he took the part of Peter: there are opportunities for clowning in the scene with the musicians (IV v 103 ff.) and for mimicry and by-play when Peter is attending the Nurse. Now in IV ii of Much Ado About Nothing in Q and F the first speech (belonging to Dogberry) is assigned to 'Keeper'; all the other Dogberry speeches throughout the scene are assigned to 'Kemp' except two: the speeches of Verges are assigned to 'Cowley' or 'Couley'. Dogberry's speech at line 4 is assigned to 'Andrew', and that at lines 14-15 is given in Q to 'Ke', in F to 'Kee'. Pollard argues that this is a trace of the prompter's handiwork (Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates, pp. 64-5), but there are strong

---

1. A most pleasant and merie newv Comedie,/Intituled,/A Knacke to knowe a Knaue./Newlie set foorth, as it hath sundrie/tyrne bene played by Ed. Allen/and his Companie./VVith Kemps applauded Merrimentes/of the men of Goteham, in receiuing/the King into Goteham./ (Device) Imprinted at London by Richard Iones, dwelling/at the signe of the Rose and Crowne, nere/Holborne bridge, 1594.

objections to this view. R. B. McKerrow ("The Elizabethan Printer and Dramatic Manuscripts", The Library, vol. XII (1931-2) pp. 253-75) points out that if the prompter inserted in his manuscript the name of the actor who played a certain part, and if a printer used the prompt-book as 'copy', the actor's name would appear in the printed text as a gloss: he gives examples from texts printed from prompt-copies. In Believe as you List we have the directions "Ent: Demetrius -- Wm. Pattrick" and "Ent: Lentulus: Mr. Rob: with a letter"; in the printed Wild Goose Chase III i we have "Enter Leuerduce, alias Lugier, Mr. Illiard"; in The Two Noble Kinsmen IV ii "Enter Messenger, Curtis"; in the 1st part of Antonio and Mellida "Enter Andrugio, Lucio, Cole and Norwood" (IV i). McKerrow thinks it much more probable that the assignments to Kemp and Cowley in <sup>Much Ado</sup> Midsummer Night's Dream IV ii were made by Shakespeare in his own manuscript, and that the book-holder was not responsible. It follows, therefore, that Shakespeare wrote the part of Dogberry with Kemp in mind: the part was written for Kemp. This is Gray's view also: Shakespeare began with what was to be the third scene in which Kemp and Cowley appeared in Much Ado, and proceeded without giving them names (after a momentary hesitation with 'Keeper' and the unsatisfactory 'Andrew' he contented himself with the actors' names): later, when he was writing another scene in which they appeared he hit upon names that pleased him and used them from then on. Q was set up from Shakespeare's 'foul papers', which the printer followed slavishly.

Kemp's art must have developed in an extraordinary fashion for Shakespeare to write the part of Dogberry especially for him as being suitable to his particular talent. Dogberry is no clown who throws slippers about. Gray suggests that by the time of the composition of Much Ado Kemp was the principal 'character-actor' rather than a mere clown. To discuss all the roles which Gray attributes to Kemp would make too long a digression here, and his theories concern us also in the sections on the Merry Wives of Windsor and the Taming of A Shrew. But consider Hamlet: what part would the principal character-actor, the player of Dogberry, take in this play? According to Gray, the part of Polonius.

There is evidence, discussed by Gray, that Kemp left the company in 1599 as the result of a quarrel of some sort. Suppose he had played the part of Corambus so effectively that the actor had become identified in the public mind with the character: suppose that to the public Corambus was William Kemp. Then Kemp leaves the company: would it not be advisable to change the name of the character? Audiences might resent the imposition upon them of a Corambus who was not Kemp: but if the name were altered they would have less ground for complaint -- at least they would not have been lured to the theatre on false pretences.

We have noted that throughout Q1 the speeches of Corambis are probably all based on those in the final Shakespearian Hamlet. It is interesting to take along with Gray's conjecture



the suggestion of Gollancz (op. cit. p.174) that possibly "the old popular name 'Corambis' was attached to the character, instead of Polonius, by the unauthorized purloiners answerable for the publication of the First Quarto".

I have set out the suggestions of Gollancz and Gray,<sup>1</sup> and the reader can judge of their value for himself. Both are undeniably pretty, but both are conjectural. In particular some people might object to the assignation of the role of Polonius to Kemp, and there is nothing which might be called evidence for it. I confess to being tolerably comfortable about only one thing -- that the speeches of Corambis in Q1 are based on those of Polonius in Q2 and F1, and that the name, and that only, may have its foundation in some earlier version of the play.

The name Montano in Q1 (for 'Reynaldo') need not detain us. Reynaldo appears in only one scene (II i). The pirate

- 
1. Two other suggestions may be mentioned: (1) In the Shakespeare Jahrbuch, Vol. 42, p.84, Creizenach writes: "Man könnte wohl vermuten, dass in den Namensformen Polonius und Reynaldo Anspielungen auf bestimmte Persönlichkeiten enthalten sind, und dass die Schauspieler deshalb es nicht wagten, diese Namen auf der Bühne auszusprechen, etwas sicheres lässt sich über die Ursache des Namenswechsels jetzt nicht mehr sagen." (2) In his Text of Shakespeare's 'Hamlet', p.45, van Dam writes: "We know how difficult it sometimes is to catch a name unknown to us which is only pronounced a few times upon the stage; it is thus quite possible that the reporter did not understand the name Polonius and left a blank in his stenograph. (Q1) could not be sent to the printer without a name for the player of the part of Polonius; a name had to be found, and, as Sir Israel Gollancz says, 'the old popular name Corambis' was found perfectly suitable."

may have forgotten it and supplied a name of his own. The problem is quite different from that of Corambis-Polonius, who is an important character. In the case of Montano-Reynaldo either explanation might fit.

## VI.

HAMLET'S AGE.

Mr R. Crompton Rhodes, calling attention to the chronological differences in the grave-yard scene between Q1 on the one hand and Q2 and F1 on the other, expresses the opinion that Q1 represents a version (post-dating the Q2 text) in which Hamlet's age had been altered so that the part might be played by a youthful actor.<sup>1</sup>

In Q2 the facts given are these:

Ham. How long hast thou been a grave-maker?

1 Clown Of all the days i'th'year I came to't that day that our last king Hamlet overcame Fortinbras.

Ham. How long is that since?

1 Clown Cannot you tell that? every fool can tell that. It was that very day that young Hamlet was born: he that is mad and sent into England.

Then, later:

1 Clown ....I have been sexton here man and boy thirty years.

And:

1 Clown ...Here's a skull now: this skull hath lien you i'th'earth three-and-twenty years.....

...this same skull, sir, was, sir, Yorick's skull...

(V i)

According to all this very particular information, Hamlet was seven years old when Yorick died, and he is now thirty. A point that must be stressed, however, is that young Fortinbras must be at least thirty years old at the time of the action of the play, since his father had been killed thirty years before. That he was killed is explicitly stated in Horatio's narrative of the same combat as that to which the Clown refers (I i 80 seq.):

.....the combat; in which our valiant Hamlet

.....

Did slay this Fortinbras.

---

1. Shakespeare's First Folio, pp. 79-80.

In the Q1 version of the grave-yard scene the Clown gives the following information:

Looke you, heres a scull hath bin here this dozen yeare,  
 Let me see, I euer since out last king Hamlet  
 Slew Fortenbrasse in combat, yong Hamlets father,  
 Hee that's mad.

Yorick has been dead for about twelve years (for the word "dozen" looks like a "round number" and need not be exact). All we know from Q1 is that both Hamlet and young Fortinbras are over twelve. Yorick had carried Hamlet on his back in Q1 also. We might therefore assume that Hamlet was about seven at the time of Yorick's death, as in the "good" texts, although Q1 gives no information as to this. In that case, then, both Hamlet and young Fortinbras would in Q1 be about nineteen years of age.

At any rate, the Q1 chronology makes it possible to regard young Fortinbras as just arrived at manhood, instead of being thirty, as he must be by the chronology of Q2 and F1.

Now if we turn back to Horatio's narrative in the first Act (I i 80 seq.), we cannot avoid believing that young Fortinbras has made the avenging of his father and the reclaiming of his lost dominions the first task of his manhood. He is "young Fortinbras,/Of unimproved mettle hot and full"; he has the support of a band of "lawless resolute". The picture is undoubtedly one of an impulsive young man, burning for revenge, aided by a "list" of reckless young adventurers. It would be totally inconsistent with the characterisation of the play to imagine that Fortinbras would wait until he was thirty before embarking on his ardent bid for vengeance and reinstatement. Yet, according to the figures in the "good" versions of the grave-yard scene, that is his age. It is the figures in the Q1 version of that scene which are consistent with his character.



If we accept the evidence of "young Fortinbras" we must also believe that Hamlet is a youth of nineteen or so. But there is nothing in the final version of the play (except the grave-yard scene) which precludes this possibility, and on the contrary there is much that positively indicates it.

Where we have two distinct chronologies, one of which is consistent with the rest of the play and the other of which is not, we are, I think, almost bound to conclude that the former was the original chronology, while the other represents an alteration made at one point for a particular reason. If Shakespeare, in the Q2 version, meant us to accept as true the Clown's evidence that Hamlet was thirty years old, it must surely be clear that he has altered the conception of Hamlet from that of a youthful figure to that of a mature man. That is to say, the chronology given in the Q1 version of the grave-yard scene is consistent with an earlier characterisation of Hamlet.

Finally, however, there is some reason to suppose that the figures given by the Clown in Q2 and F1 were not meant to be taken literally. This is suggested by V. Østerberg in a brilliant little pamphlet entitled Prince Hamlet's Age (Copenhagen, 1924). He points out (p. 19) that "an author does not make himself responsible for the correctness of the words he puts into the mouths of his characters. They may make mistakes, lie, blaspheme, boast, indulge in set phrases, etc., according to their several natures and, as it were, at their own risk....Who says that the Clown was meant to speak the objective truth in boasting of his thirty years' sextonship? Why may we not as well suppose that the phrase was intended by the author as a humorous and palpable exaggeration on the Clown's part?"

Whether we believe that Shakespeare never intended us to consider Hamlet a thirty-years-old man, or whether we believe that by the time he came to the writing of Act V he was thinking of his hero as older than he had conceived him at the beginning, we cannot, I think, believe with Mr Crompton Rhodes that Hamlet's youthfulness in Q1 is the result of deliberate adaptation to special circumstances.

SUMMING-UP.

In the fore-going study I have not attempted a complete analysis of the first Quarto text of Hamlet. I have concerned myself only with the establishment of certain points. These may be summed up here.

Section I. The 'copy' for Q1 was, at certain points at least, composite. The second stratum consists of interpolations made from memory.

Section II. The original stratum of text owes its existence to memorial transmission. Verse in Q1 which bears no direct relation to the corresponding passages in the "good" texts is the work of some third-rate poet who brought together various remembered fragments from different <sup>portions</sup> in the final version of the play and fused them into verse of his own.

Section III. While the bulk of the Q1 text can be explained as depending on the final Shakespearian play, there are one or two points where an earlier version seems to be drawn on. I would suggest that at such points the compilers of the Q1 text confused the final Shakespearian play with an earlier Hamlet. I should say that Q1 Hamlet is an attenuated and deformed reproduction of the Q2 text, with a few infiltrations from an earlier play on the same subject.

I do not propose to give here a list of works on the first Quarto of Hamlet, since there already exists a very comprehensive and easily accessible 'Hamlet' Bibliography and Reference Guide, 1877-1935, compiled by Anton Adolph Raven (published in 1936 by the University of Chicago Press). Works on Q1 will be found listed (with synopses of contents) in section II of this compilation: see especially sub-section D.

In the Introduction to the present section of this thesis I have mentioned works by critics before 1877 (in addition to others). Here I shall content myself with the mention of three works bearing on Q1 Hamlet published after the appearance of Raven's bibliography.

Cairncross, A.S.      The Problem of Hamlet: A Solution (1936)

Hart, Alfred      The Vocabulary of the First Quarto of Hamlet,  
Review of English Studies, vol. XII (1936) pp.  
18-30 (cf. also Elizabethan Play Abridgement,  
R.E.S. vol. X (1934) pp. 1-28).

Parrott, T.M. &  
Craig, Hardin      The Tragedy of Hamlet: A Critical Edition of  
the Second Quarto (1938): see Introduction,  
pp. 26-41.



THE QUARTO OF 'HENRY V'.

CHAPTER I.

ACT I.

In two articles in The Library for 1918<sup>1</sup> Professor Dover Wilson advanced the theory that the 'copy' for the 1st Quarto of Hamlet was composite. The basic stratum was a transcription of an abridgement of a play only partially worked over by Shakespeare; the second stratum consisted of interpolations made by a pirate-actor who had taken part in performances of the fully revised play.

I was able to show in an essay on Q1 Hamlet that, while the existence in the text of two distinct strata is an indubitable fact, both strata were memorially transmitted. The text is a composite memorial piracy.

In the Times Literary Supplement for March 13th, 1919 Professors Pollard and Dover Wilson applied to the Quarto of Henry V the same methods as the latter had previously applied to Q1 Hamlet, and a similar conclusion resulted. They contended that the basis of the 'copy' was a transcript of a shortened form of the play as partially revised by Shakespeare, and that a pirate-actor who had played in the final version made certain additions from memory. I believe that this hypothesis must be modified in the same way as in the case of Q1 Hamlet.

In the 1918 articles Professor Dover Wilson used as a criterion for detecting interpolations a textual phenomenon which he called 'repetition-brackets'. This phenomenon consists of

---

1. The 'Copy' for Hamlet, 1603 and The Hamlet Transcript, 1593.

the repetition of the same line or lines, sometimes in slightly different forms, separated by an intervening passage. This intervening passage, along with the second occurrence of the repeated line or lines, was regarded as interpolated material.

In the Review of English Studies for 1930 (pp. 300 seq.) Dr Greg states that it was not unusual to write additions to a manuscript play on a separate piece of paper, or in the margin, the lines of the addition concluding with the line of the original text which was intended to follow the addition in the amplified version. He adduces examples from the manuscript of The Second Maid's Tragedy. Here, for instance, an addition made on a separate sheet of paper concludes with the words "I do beseech yor grace looke cheerfullie", corresponding to the line in the original part of the manuscript which runs "I do beseech yor matie (i.e. maiestie) looke cheerfull". Dr Greg says that the position which such additions were to occupy in the final versions was sometimes not indicated sufficiently precisely: if a compositor inserted an addition one line later than it should have come, the result would be what Professor Dover Wilson called a 'repetition-bracket'.

It is necessary to point out that in the same article Dr Greg warns us that this need not be the only explanation of such repetitions. He advances the possibility that a repetition-bracket might equally well indicate an excision. Thus, if it is desired to cut out a passage, the first words to be retained after the cut might be written in the margin beside the



last words to be retained before it. If a compositor, ignoring the excision, sets up the whole manuscript as he sees it a repetition would result.

Furthermore, Dr Greg suggests that where we come across repetitions of this kind in a 'bad' text neither of these explanations is necessarily called for: "it seems possible to regard them as quite likely results of memorial reconstruction".

In view of these contingencies we should be exceedingly reluctant to commit ourselves to the view that a 'repetition-bracket' in the Quarto of Henry V necessarily indicates composite 'copy'.

One such repetition-bracket occurs in the Quarto text of Act 1.

The sad eyde Iustice with his surly humme,  
 Deliuering vp to executors pale, the lazy caning Drone.  
 This I infer, that 20. actions once a foote,  
 May all end in one moment.  
 As many Arrowes losed seuerall wayes, flye to one marke:  
 As many seuerall wayes meete in one towne:  
 As many fresh streames run in one selfe sea:  
 As many lines close in the dyall center:  
 So may a thousand actions once a foote  
 End in one moment, and be all well borne without defect.  
 Therefore my Liege to France,  
 Diuide etc.

(Q Act I lines 132-142).

The two 'arms' of the repetition-bracket are (a) "that 20. actions once a foote, / May all end in one moment" and (b) "So may a thousand actions once a foote, / End in one moment, and be all well borne without defect". That the second 'arm' is not an exact repetition of the first, but a partially corrected and amplified version of it, does not matter. If this is in

fact a case of interpolation, the interpolator may well have desired to correct and expand the lines of the original which he intended to follow his addition.

Now, supposing that the material from "As many Arrowes..." to "...without defect" is an interpolation, there are two evidences which suggest that it was made from memory without the assistance of any authentic manuscript. It is fair to assume that the interpolation at least was intended to reproduce the final text as found in the Folio: this was the Pollard-Wilson view with regard to the second stratum, and it is self evident.

1. The second arm of the Q repetition-bracket contains the words "End in one moment"; the corresponding phrase in F is (line 214 of I ii) "End (misprinted 'And') in one purpose". The Q variant owes its existence to the first arm of the repetition bracket (Q line 135: "May all end in one moment"). So the second arm of the repetition does not fully correct the first. Exactly the same thing is found in scene 5 of the 1st Quarto of Hamlet: Professor Dover Wilson's repetition-bracket is (a) lines 3 and 4: "And bid him ply his learning, good Montano./ Mon. I will my lord". (b) Lines 30 and 31: "Cor. And bid him ply his musicke / Mon. My lord I wil". As De Groot pointed

out (letter to T.L.S., March 8, 1923), the word bid in line 30 corresponds to the let of the 'good' texts. This Q1 variant bid points back to bid in line 3.<sup>1</sup> So, although 'learning' is corrected to 'musicke' in accordance with the "good" texts, the "bid" of the first arm of the bracket remains unaltered. We are dealing with partial correction only. It is therefore reasonable to suppose that the interpolator had access to no authentic manuscript but was relying on an imperfect recollection of the final version.

2. The Folio contains a metrical irregularity. The words  
Come to one marke: as many wayes meet in one towne,  
appear as a single line. The Quarto divides according to the natural method of delivery:

As many Arrowes losed seuerall wayes, flye to one  
marke:

The repetition of "seuerall" before "wayes" in the next line has the effect of making a metrical line of it, and is therefore more likely to be the work of the transmitter than a visual error on the part of the compositor. Again there is the suggestion that

---

1. De Groot himself does not agree with Dover Wilson's theory of the significance of this repetition-bracket. He holds that it is the result of a careless first revision by Shakespeare of the Kyd play. Lines 1-4 are Kyd's, the rest Shakespeare's. The latter intended to strike out lines 3 & 4, substituting his own version at the end. Presumably therefore 'let' was substituted for 'bid' in a second revision. Against this we must merely put the indisputable fact that Hamlet Q1 is a reported text throughout. The case for Q Henry V as a first sketch will be shown to be baseless later on.

no authentic manuscript underlies the text here.

We can, then, go so far as to say that it is possible that the 'copy' for Q Henry V was composite, and that the second stratum was added from memory only. Remembering Dr Greg's warning, we can go no further than to state the possibility of the existence of two strata of text.

Part of the theory of Professors Pollard and Wilson is tenable, therefore: but as regards the transmission of the first stratum strong objections exist to their theory of transcription. They used as criteria of interpolation not only repetition-brackets, but metrical irregularity and mislineation. Now if marks of memorial transmission can be shown to exist where no interpolation can be suspected, we shall be in a position to submit that both strata represent memorial reconstruction: this would agree with my suggestions as regards the first Quarto of Hamlet.

I give here a list of passages from the Quarto version of Act I where confusion has occurred with earlier or later passages in the play.

1. Q line 3 ...some serious matters touching vs and France  
 F lines 6-7 ...some things of weight  
 That taske our thoughts concerning vs and France.

With Q compare F I i 81 seq.:

And in regard of causes now in hand,  
 Which I have opened to his Grace at large,  
 As touching France.....



2. Q line 26 No female shall succeed in salicke land

F line 41 No Woman shall succeed in Salike Land.

Q anticipates F line 52:

to wit, No Female  
Should be Inheratrix in Salike Land:

Corresponding to this latter passage Q has (line 38):

To wit,  
No female shall succeed in salike land:

i.e. a repetition of Q line 26. Two similar passages in F are confused in Q, viz. F line 41 and lines 52-3; one element ("No Female") is taken from line 52, and another ("shall succeed in salicke land") from line 41. A conflation is made and the resulting line used at both points.

3. Q line 30 Yet their owne writers faithfully affirme

F line 45 Yet their owne Authors faithfully affirme

Q anticipates F line 66:

...Besides, their Writers say,  
which occurs in a passage omitted in Q.

4. Q line 60 Then amply to impace their crooked causes

F line 96 Then amply to imbarre their crooked Titles

With Q cf. the passage from F I i quoted in No. 1:

causes now in hand.....as touching France.

Cf. also F II ii 59:

And now to our French causes.

In view of the fact that the passage in F I i contains also the phrase "as touching France" which is distinctly echoed in the Q version of I ii<sup>3</sup>, I should suggest it as the likelier source here: see No. 1.

5. Q line 81 We must not onely arme vs against the French  
 F line 138 We must not onely arme t'inuade the French.

Q anticipates F line 140:

to defend / Against the Scot.....

The corresponding Q phrase is 'for the Scot'.

6. Q line 86 We do not meane the coursing sneakers onely  
 F line 145 We do not meane the coursing snatchers onely  
 Q anticipates F line 172:

To her vnguarded Nest, the Weazell (Scot)  
 Comes sneaking.....

"Comes sneaking" is omitted in the Q passage corresponding to this.

7. Q line 163 The Dolphins pleasure and our Embassage  
 F line 242 The Dolphins meaning and our Embassie.  
 With Q cf. F lines 236-7.

..prepar'd to know the pleasure  
 Of our faire Cosin Dolphin.....

Corresponding to this Q has:

Now are we well prepared to know the Dolphins  
pleasure.

8. Q line 178 ..this the Dolphin saith  
 F line 260 ..this the Dolphin speakes  
 With Q cf. F lines 252-3:

the Prince our Master / Sayes that...

At the point corresponding to this Q has:

He saith..... (Q line 173: cf. also Q line 169).

9. Q line 108 To his vnfurnisht nest the weazell Scot

F line 171 To her vnguarded Nest, the Weazell (Scot)

With Q cf. F line 150

But that the Scot, on his vnfurnisht Kingdome,  
Came pouring.....

10. Q line 120 For so liue the honey bees, creatures that  
by awe / Ordaine....

F line 189 ...for so worke the Hony Bees / Creatures  
that by a rule in Nature teach....

Q anticipates F line 226:

France being ours, wee'l bend it to our Awe.

11. Q lines 164-5 We are no tyrant, but a Christian King,  
To whom our spirit is as subject...

F lines 243-4 We are no Tyrant, but a Christian King,  
Vnto whose grace our passion is as subject..

Q anticipates F line 257:

He therefore sends you meeter for your spirit  
( 'you' is Henry, who speaks the earlier two lines ).

12. Q line 175 Therefore he sendeth meeter for your study

F line 257 He therefore sends you meeter for your spirit.

With Q cf. F I i 43-44:

Heare him debate of Common-wealth Affaires;  
You would say, it hath been all in all his study

and also line 59 of the same scene:

And neuer noted him in any studie.

These anticipations and recollections in the Quarto at  
points where no interpolation can be shown to exist: Nos. 1-8

and 12 occur in lines which are perfectly metrical and which form no part of any structurally defective passage. In some cases there are defective passages in the neighbourhood, but the relevant lines are not themselves involved. The 'anticipation' noted in No. 11 occurs in a line which is one syllable short, but that is certainly insufficient reason for suspecting an addition. The same is true of the 'recollection' in No. 9: it is contained in a line which is followed by a half-line tacked on to the beginning of the next line. The Q lines referred to in Nos. 9 and 10 are so closely bound up with their context that they cannot be removed without shattering the whole sequence: and an incoherent first stratum is scarcely favourable to the theory that it represents a transcription of an abridgement. If the passage

For so liue the honey bees, creatures that by awe  
Ordaine an act of order to a peopeld Kingdome:

is regarded as an interpolation it follows that the succeeding twelve and a half lines (all metrically accurate and correctly divided) are incomprehensible, as it would not be stated to what they refer.

No. 2 contains both an anticipation and a recollection. Thus we have in the Q text of Act I no fewer than thirteen cases of anticipation or recollection at points where no interpolation can be shown to exist. The whole scene contains 220 lines in Q: so, even leaving out of account the possibility of interpolations at other points, we have an average of one anticipation or recollection to every sixteen lines.



Professor Dover Wilson has shown in the case of the Folio of Hamlet that the 'copy' was prepared by a scribe who knew the play, who occasionally allowed his memory to usurp the function of his eye, and who confused different passages, producing a series of anticipations and recollections.<sup>1</sup> But the average which we have calculated in the case of the Henry V scene with which we are dealing is far too high to permit of this explanation. Nor can we assume in a stenographer a knowledge of the play which would permit of his anticipating passages not yet spoken from the stage. Memorial reconstruction seems the only satisfactory hypothesis for the transmission of the text: and memorial transmission is traced in passages which must, according to the Pollard-Wilson hypothesis, have formed part of the original stratum of their composite 'copy'.

E. K. Chambers (William Shakespeare, vol. 1, p.394) argues very cogently against the Pollard-Wilson position: "In the verse scenes Pollard and Wilson take the metrical lines as derived from the transcript and the bungled lines as attempts of the reporter to fill the gaps. The metrical or tolerably metrical lines amount so far as I can judge to about 500 for the whole play, and would give a very sketchy outline of the plot, with many solutions of continuity in the dialogue." It is this lack of continuity which would result from cutting out

---

1. The Manuscript of Shakespeare's 'Hamlet', Vol. I, pp. 50 ff.

the un-metrical bits which is perhaps the strongest argument against the Pollard-Wilson theory: we expect an abridger, working with a full text in front of him, to produce at least an intelligible version. Hereward T. Price makes the same point (The Text of Henry V, p.21). He takes as an example the long speech in II ii beginning "The mercy which was quit in us but late" (F line 79, Q line 59): "...supposing we take the whole speech as it stands in the Quarto, and try to make sense of the 'good' lines without the help of the bad ones. It simply cannot be done. There might be some disagreement as to what constitutes a 'good' line; but when you have got your good lines together, however you choose them, you will find they imply the existence of the bad lines, because, without the latter, or what stands for the latter in the Folio, the speech will not hold together."

If the 'copy' for Q Henry V was composite, and if both strata were memorially transmitted, it follows that metrical defects are not in themselves adequate grounds for supposing passages to be interpolations. A memorial lapse, resulting in a structural break-down, might as well have occurred during the first stage of a composite memorial piracy as during the second.

To sum up: criticising the 1919 hypothesis of Professors Pollard and Dover Wilson, I would suggest that we can go no further than to say that the 'copy' may have been composite, and that, if it was, it represented a composite memorial reconstruction.

THE PLAY UNDERLYING THE QUARTO TEXT.

H. A. Evans (Arden ed. intro. p. xvii) says that "the theory formerly put forward by Pope and others, that the Q gives us Shakespeare's first sketch of the play, which he afterwards revised and re-wrote at greater length in the form in which we find it in the Folio, may be considered to be exploded". Johnson, Knight, Collier and Brinsley Nicholson also accepted the first sketch theory.<sup>1</sup>

The great mistake made by these critics was that in dealing with the question of what stage of the play's history underlies Q they omitted to consider the indispensable preliminary question of how the text was transmitted.

Brinsley Nicholson, arguing for the first sketch theory, (Transactions of the New Shakspeare Soc., 1880-2, Pt. 1, pp. 77 ff.) went through the play in detail, pointing out how often the Quarto gives a reading which is inferior to that of the Folio. He then jumps at the conclusion that therefore the Quarto represents a first sketch and the Folio a revision. But he omits even to mention the existence of a problem concerning the method by which the Quarto text came into existence. He is totally unaware of the anticipations and recollections which

---

1. See Pope, Works of Shakespeare, 1728, Vol. I, preface, pp. xvii-xix; Johnson, Works of Shakespeare, 1765, Vol. IV, pp. 372, 394, 408; Knight, Pictorial edition, Vol. I, pp. 309 ff.; Collier, Works of Shakespeare, 1842, Vol. IV, pp. 461-3. Nicholson is cited below.

are of such great importance in this connection; nor does he appreciate that to accuse even the young Shakespeare of such outrageous metrical incompetence is at least unwise. It is perfectly clear that if the problem of the nature of the transmission of the Quarto text is first dealt with, and the obvious conclusion reached that it is a pirated text and more particularly a memorial reconstruction, the inferior readings of the Quarto which Nicholson lists may with the greatest of ease be ascribed to the unauthorised transmitters of that version. "In all I think it will at once appear" says Nicholson "that the Folio shows signs of improvement and not unfrequently of augmentation, both of the thought and of its expression." He does not realise that, the status of the Quarto having been first established as that of a memorial reconstruction, the same evidence points to the conclusion that the Quarto shows signs of debasement and not unfrequently curtailment both of the thought and of its expression. That is the correct emphasis.

I give only one or two examples of the wrong-headedness of Nicholson's argument and the objection which must be advanced against it. Comparing line 171 in the two texts -- Q To his vnfurnisht nest F To her vnguarded Nest -- he says "'unfurnisht' is a wrong epithet and 'unguarded' a right one, for the very reason that draws the weasel is that the nest is furnisht with eggs". But he fails to notice that the Quarto reading results from a recollection of a previous passage (line 150) where the King refers to his grandfather's "unfurnisht Kingdome". That



is to say, he fails to see that the Quarto variant comes about in the process of transmission. Similarly at line 96 Nicholson speaks of "the change of 'causes' to 'Titles'": we have already seen that the Q reading 'causes' is also the result of association between separate passages in the play and is likewise to be attributed to the type of transmission undergone by the text. So, again, he writes: "In line 244 can there be a comparison between 'To whom our spirit is as subject' and 'Unto whose grace our passion is as subject'?" He considers the Q version a first sketch, ignoring both the metrical irregularity and the fact that spirit is an anticipation of F line 257 ('He therefore sends you meeter for your spirit'), which two points, taken together, themselves suggest irregular transmission. At other places Nicholson sets down as Shakespeare's first sketch passages where the absolute breakdown of metre and structure make inept derivation from the Folio version very much more probable: for instance, compare Q lines 158-9 with F lines 236 seq.:

Q Now are we well prepared to know the Dolphins pleasure,  
For we heare your comming is from him.

F Now are we well prepar'd to know the pleasure  
Of our faire Cosin Dolphin: for we heare,  
Your greeting is from him, not from the King.

"In which are Henry's qualities of quick resolve, openness, and courtesy best shown?" asks Nicholson, arguing that Q represents the first sketch, F. a revision: he fails even to mention the structural faults which point far more strongly to imperfect representation of F than to the work of Shakespeare in his

earliest period; it has often seemed to me that critics who argue in the facile manner of Dr Nicholson impute to Shakespeare a most extraordinary development from quite miserable ineptitude in his early days to complete perfection within comparatively few years.

At certain points Nicholson takes no notice even of the possibility of printing-house corruption (although at one point he does). Compare the following two versions:

(a) F I ii 10 seq.	<u>King</u> Sure we thanke you.	
	My learned Lord, we pray you to proceed,	11
	And iustly and religiously vnfold,	
	Why the Law Salike.....	13

(b) Q Act I line 6 seq.

King Shure we thank you. And good my Lord proceed  
Why the Lawe Salicke.....

Nicholson's comment is: "Nor need I do more than call attention to the great verbal improvement of 'unfold', F., over 'proceed', Q., as the latter might merely imply that he (i.e. Canterbury) is to rehearse before the assembly arguments and conclusions as to which he and Henry were already in accord". Judging by the wording of this comment, one might imagine that Nicholson had failed to notice the word 'proceed' in line 11 of the Folio version; he has certainly failed to take into account the possibility that there is an accidental omission in Q of the line "And justly and religiously unfold".

There is no need to multiply instances of Nicholson's defective arguing; enough to say that there is not a single variant in the Q version of Act I which cannot be ascribed to

a memorial reporter's bungling attempts to reproduce the version found in the Folio. This is Daniel's conclusion<sup>1</sup> (introduction to the New Shakespeare Society's parallel-text edition of Q and F, 1877) and Chambers agrees: "If Q is read side by side with F, it is impossible to regard it as anything but a continual perversion of the same text." (William Shakespeare, Vol. I, p.391.)

#### ABRIDGEMENT

In the introduction to the parallel-text edition Daniel argued that it is an abridgement of the play found in the Folio which underlies the Quarto.

Once again we must take into account the fact that the Quarto text was memorially transmitted. Then the question of the significance of omission in that text becomes difficult. The omission of a passage does not in itself necessitate the conclusion that it was excised in a stage-abridgement any more than it necessarily implies that the passage in question was added in the course of a Shakespearean revision of a first sketch: failure of memory on the part of the reporter or reporters is an important factor.

---

1. Except that Daniel differs as regards the method of piracy, contending that Q was set up "probably from an imperfect manuscript surreptitiously obtained and vamped up from notes taken during the performance, as we know was frequently done" (op. cit. p. x).

Daniel was arguing against the upholders of the first sketch theory; and he is scrupulously fair to his opponents. Thus, talking of the significance of omissions in the Quarto (which these opponents would account for by assuming that they were added during the revision), he writes: "If in a single case it can be proved, not that the Q. is merely deficient in, but that it actually omits any portion of the F. version, judgment may be allowed to pass on other places where the evidence is not of so convincing a character." (op. cit. p. xi)

He then proceeds to cite two cases where a passage in the Folio text can be proved to have been actually omitted in the Quarto; one of these occurs in Act I. I quote Daniel:

I must now ask the reader to turn to Act I, sc.ii and compare lines 47-55 of Q. with lines 67-91 of F. 'Hugh Capet also,' says the Q. Why also? There is nothing in the Q. to account for this adverb. We turn to the F. and find that it is the case of King Pepin to which the Q. refers, but which it omits. But this is not all; in the F. after the case of Hugh Capet, there is next cited the case of King Lewes, who justified his possession of the crown as being descended from

The daughter to Charles, the foresaid Duke of Loraine. The Q., which also has this line, makes no previous mention of this 'foresaid Duke of Loraine'. Again here is proof of omission. But still this is not all: the Q. further by its injudicious omissions actually makes Hugh Capet, who deposed and murdered Charles of Loraine, fortify his title to the throne with the plea that he was descended from the daughter of this very Charles, confounding at the same time this daughter of Charles of Loraine with the daughter of Charlemaine; and then, rejoining the current of the F., with it, it sums up all the three cases of kings who claimed in 'right and title of the female', of two of which it has no previous mention. I have not overlooked the fact that, in this summing up, the Q. turns King Lewes into King Charles, but this I look upon as a mere blunder, of no significance for or against my argument; it might be noticed as an instance of corruption on the part of the Q., but has nothing to do with the question of omission with which I am principally concerned.

(op. cit. pp. xi-xii.)



As far as it goes this is admirable; it is certainly proved beyond doubt that we are dealing with omission from the Quarto and not addition to the Folio. But even the evidence adduced by Daniel here does not prove the presence of a stage-abridgement behind the Quarto. The Quarto version of this speech is quite incoherent as Daniel himself shows: are we to suppose that we have to do with an abridger who was totally unable to do his work neatly and who, in excising passages, left the remainder quite incomprehensible? We know that the text was made up from memory; the genealogy set out in this speech is complicated; the incoherence of the Quarto version, caused by its 'injudicious' omissions calls aloud for assignment to the imperfection of a reporter's memory. Daniel sets down the substitution of Charles for Lewes to corruption in the Quarto; presumably he is to be taken as referring that corruption to the imperfect transmission of the text. He should therefore have considered the possibility of the omissions being due to the same cause. These omissions, resulting in incoherence, are corruption and not abridgement; they are much more probably due to imperfect memorial transmission than to extremely inept abridgement. Once again, the type of transmission undergone by the text must be taken into account in determining what underlies the text. Admittedly Daniel thought of Q in terms of stenographic transmission; but even a stenographer can find himself unable to note down all he hears. Before advancing the hypothesis of a stage-abridgement behind Q we must discover evidence

much less equivocal than this.

Such evidence does exist. The clues which lead to the abridgement hypothesis are minute, but the basis they provide is solid.

The crux of the matter is the omission from Q of the first scene of Act I. It is a highly interesting question of plus or minus. Three problems suggest themselves:

1. Did the scene exist at all at the time when the <sup>x</sup>test of Q was made up? That is to say, is Q after all an imperfect reproduction of a Shakespearean first draft, and was scene i added by Shakespeare in a subsequent revision of that first draft? Commenting on I i Johnson quotes Pope who asserts that it was added after the edition of 1608<sup>1</sup> "which is much short of the present editions, wherein the speeches are generally enlarged and raised: Several whole scenes besides, and all the chorus's also, were since added by Shakespeare" (Johnson, ed. of Shakespeare, 1765, Vol. IV, p.363). Other scenes omitted by the Quarto are III i and IV ii.
2. If the absence of scene i is an actual case of omission in Q (and not addition in F) was it omitted in the course of

---

1. I.e. the edition printed in 1619 with the imprint "Printed by T.P., 1608". See Pollard, Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates, pp. viii-xiii.

deliberate abridgement, or

3. Was it omitted merely because of imperfect memory on the part of the reporter or reporters?

Attention has already been drawn to one possible and two definite verbal links between the Q version of I ii and the F version of the absent scene.

- (a) Whereas F I ii 6-7 reads

some things of weight  
That taske our thoughts, concerning vs and France

Q has (line 3)

some serious matters touching vs and France.

With this compare F scene i lines 81 seq.:

And in regard of causes now in hand,  
Which I have opened to his Grace at large,  
As touching France.....

- (b) At I ii 96 F reads:

Then amply to imbarre their crooked Titles,  
while at line 60 Q has:

Then amply to imbace their crooked causes.

With this compare F scene i line 81:

And in regard of Causes now in hand...

(these 'causes' being of course in reference to France).

- (c) At I ii 257 F has:

Therefore he sendeth meeter for your spirit  
while at line 175 Q has:

Therefore he sendeth meeter for your study.

Compare F scene i line 44:

You would say it hath been all in all his study  
and also line 59:

And neuer noted in him any studie.

('study' referring in both cases to Henry.)

Thus we have in the Quarto version of I ii three distinct recollections of I i, which scene the Quarto totally omits. It follows that scene i must have been in existence at the time when the Quarto text was being made up. Although the reporter (or reporters) knew something about this scene, as has been shown, no attempt is made to reconstruct any of it. Its omission is therefore to be attributed to deliberate abridgement. We are dealing with a reporter reconstructing a stage-abridgement; but he had some acquaintance, however scanty, with the full version which contained scene i.

Since working this out, I have discovered that H. R. Hoppe (Review of English Studies, July 1938, pp. 271 seq.) has advanced a precisely similar view of the first Quarto of Romeo and Juliet, on precisely similar grounds, viz. distinct traces of omitted material in variants at other points in the text.

"Perhaps the reporter (or reporters) had once acted in a full-length version that represented the drama substantially in its Q2 form; subsequently he had participated in a shortened version. When he came to report the play, he tried to reconstruct it in its complete form, but he could recall vividly only the shortened tragedy he had recently taken part in, the passages omitted from the longer version surviving occasionally as tags imbedded elsewhere in the text, usually where the context or situation was similar."

(op. cit. p.275.)

This is precisely the conclusion to which I have been led in

the case of Q Henry V: there is just one small point of difference -- in view of the fact that no attempt is made to reproduce any of scene i at all, I would suggest that the reporter concerned was consciously reconstructing the abridgement and not the full version: for he had some knowledge of scene i, as we have seen, and might have been expected to make some attempt, however imperfect, to reproduce something of it had he desired to reconstruct the full version.

The theory that the absence of I i from Q is due to deliberate shortening of the full play is reinforced by the omission from Q of F I ii 132-137, a speech in which the Archbishop of Canterbury, inciting the King to war with France, says --

In ayde whereof, we of the Spiritualltie  
Will raise your Highnesse such a mightie Summe,  
As neuer did the Clergie at one time  
Bring in to any of your Ancestors.

Let us go back for a moment: why does Act I scene i exist, from the dramatic point of view? For one thing, it serves to connect the play with the Henry IV plays by its reference to the former wild ways of the then Prince, and the immediate change in him on his father's death. One of the verbal links noted above is with a passage in I i which deals with these matters (the "study" link): presumably therefore this connection with these earlier years existed in the full version when Q was made up: as far as the actual drama is concerned this continuity with the previous reign could easily be sacrificed. An even more important function of Act I scene i is concerned with the motivation of the present play itself. The King has ambitions



with regard to France; but he is anxious to make only legitimate claims. "May we with right and conscience make this claim?" is the key-note to his attitude in the first Act. He has great confidence in the judgment of the Archbishop of Canterbury, who strongly urges him (I ii) to undertake the expedition, skilfully demonstrating its justification. But the Archbishop has a very good, and by no means altruistic, motive for the pressure he exerts; and this motive is fully explained in the scene omitted in the Quarto. A bill is being 'urged' the effect of which will be to deprive the Church of the "better half of its Possession"; in order to "mitigate" this bill, the Archbishop offers the King a large sum of money from the Church to forward an invasion of France: it is a policy of astute bribery.

He (i.e. the King) seems indifferent:  
 Or rather swaying more vpon our part,  
 Then cherishing th'exhibitors against vs: (i.e. the Commons)  
 For I haue made an offer to his Maiestie,  
 Vpon our Spirituall Conuocation,  
 And in regard of causes now in hand,  
 Which I haue opened to his Grace at large,  
 As touching France, to giue a greater Summe,  
 Then euer at one time the Clergie yet  
 Did to his Predecessors part withall.

(F I i 76-85.)

Note particularly that the other two verbal links between Q I ii and F I i refer to this passage (the causes link, and the touching link). So this part of I i also existed at the time when the Q text was made up. In F the attitude of the Archbishop in I ii is fully explained previously in I i: in Q that attitude is not explained at all, although we know from two verbal traces of I i that the explanation was in existence when the copy for Q

was written. And the abridger has been consistent in his cutting: for F I ii 132-7 is also cut in Q -- a passage which refers back to the motivation provided in Act I scene 1.

The reason for the deliberate cutting of material which is dramatically important is not difficult to discover. The first scene consists entirely of conversation between the Archbishops of Canterbury and Ely. In the Folio version of scene ii the latter speaks only fourteen lines (lines 117-123 and 168-174). Of his two speeches the first is entirely omitted in the Quarto version; the second, which is more closely bound up with its context, is retained, but is assigned not to Ely but merely to an unidentified 'Lord'. And in F Ely appears only in Act I. This chain of circumstances furnishes proof as complete as could be desired that in the stage-abridgement it was desired to get rid of the part of Ely: that is to say, the main (if not the only) reason for the excision of I i was to reduce the number of actors necessary in a performance of the play. One of Ely's speeches in I ii (F I ii 168-174) was so securely embedded in its context that it could not easily be removed; it was therefore in all probability assigned to some other character who was on the stage, it does not matter which. The memorial reconstructor knew that Ely's part had been cut and that this necessary speech had been re-assigned; he forgot to which character it had been given, so he just wrote the indefinite 'Lord'. As a matter of fact, Ely's words might in the abridgement have been lumped together with Canterbury's previous speech or with Exeter's

following one: consider then the number of speaking parts in F and Q respectively in I ii. F has King, Exeter, Westmoreland, Canterbury, Ely, and an Ambassador; Q has King, Exeter, Canterbury, and an Ambassador: F has 6, Q only 4, speaking characters. The complete absence of Westmoreland's speeches in the Q version of I ii (F lines 4, 127-131) is a sign of consistent cutting with a view to reducing the number of speaking actors. For Westmoreland appears in F II ii, IV iii, and V ii; but he does not appear at all in the Quarto: in that text, speeches of Westmoreland's are preserved in IV iii, but they are assigned to Warwick.

It has thus been possible to discover indications of deliberate abridgement behind Q more positive than those adduced by Daniel. The incoherent condition of lines 47 seq. of the Q version of I ii ('Hugh Capet also....') is to be attributed to the ineptitude of a reporter rather than to an abridger: a reporter's poor memory is much more likely to produce incoherent rubbish than a professional abridger's cutting. The cutting which we have just examined is at least competently done; the subtle motivation of the early part of the play disappears, but the text retains complete coherence in itself.

I submit that it can be accepted as established that behind the Quarto text of Act I there lies a stage-abridgement in which two speaking parts were successfully got rid of.

ALFRED HART and Q 'HENRY V'.

We have been led to the conclusion which Alfred Hart<sup>1</sup> argued for as regards all the Shakespearean 'bad' Quartos: contending that most of the plays in 'good' Quartos and Folio are far too long for performance in the two hours which a great many Elizabethan and Jacobean dramatists (including Shakespeare) agree in stating as the usual time taken up by a play, Hart argues that the omissions in the Shakespearean 'bad' texts are to be proportioned between abridgement and piratical inefficiency. Reporters reconstruct stage-abridgements, omitting material which stood in these abridgements.

Whether or not we agree with the absolutely literal interpretation placed by Hart upon the "two hours' traffic of our stage", we must agree from what has already been said that he is right in the case of Q Henry V in dividing the responsibility for the omissions as he does.

Let us now return for a moment to the corrupt genealogical passage in Q (lines 43-55, corresponding to F I ii 58-91). We have already contended that the incoherence of this passage is due rather to imperfect memorial transmission than to deliberate stage abridgement. It is possible, however, that the full

---

1. Review of English Studies, January 1934; also Shakespeare and the Homilies (sections on Play Abridgement) Melbourne Univ. Press, 1934.

analysis should be somewhat more complex.

If we consult the Folio version of the passage and try to decide upon a passage which might be sacrificed in a stage-abridgement without adversely affecting the sequence or intelligibility of the remainder, we shall probably fix on lines 62-66a: referring to Pharamond F proceeds

Who died within the year of our Redemption,  
Four hundred twentie six: and Charles the Great  
Subdu'd the Saxons, and did seat the French  
Beyond the river Sala, in the yeere  
Eight hundred fiue.

Two points would occur in favour of cutting this passage: (1) exact dates are unnecessary and tedious; (2) the more important parts of the information contained here have already been given at F lines 48 seq.:

Between the Flouds of Sala and of Elue:  
Where Charles the Great hauing subdu'd the Saxons,  
There left behind and settled certaine French: etc.

-- lines which are fully represented in the Quarto. Thus these four and a half lines might have been cut in a stage-abridgement such as that which we know to underlie the Quarto text, and their absence from Q might be due to this fact. On the other hand, those other omissions which vitiate the sequence and intelligibility of the passage occurred only during the process of imperfect transmission. I append a reconstruction of the history of the text at this point:



(a) The full text (i.e. F):

Then doth it well appeare, the Salike Law  
 Was not deuised for the Realme of France:  
 Nor did the French possesse the Salike Land,  
 Vntill foure hundred one and twentie yeeres  
 After defunction of King Pharamond,  
 Idly supposed the founder of this Law,  
 Who died within the yeere of our Redemption,  
 Four hundred twentie six: and Charles the Great  
 Subdu'd the Saxons, and did seat the French  
 Beyond the river Sala, in the yeere  
 Eight hundred fiue. Besides their Writers say,  
 King Pepin, which deposed Childericke,  
 Did as Heire Generall, being descended  
 Of Blithild, which was daughter to King Clothair,  
 Make Clayme and Title to the Crowne of France.  
 Hugh Capet also, who vsurpt the Crowne.....

(b) The authentic stage-abridgement:

Then doth it well appeare, the Salike Law  
 Was not deuised for the realme of France:  
 Nor did the French possesse the Salike Land,  
 Vntill foure hundred one and twentie yeeres  
 After defunction of King Pharamond,  
 Idly supposed the founder of this Law.  
 Besides their Writers say,  
 King Pepin, which deposed Childericke,  
 Did as Heire Generall, being descended  
 Of Blithild, which was daughter to King Clothair,  
 Make Clayme and Title to the Crowne of France.  
 Hugh Capet also, who vsurpt the Crowne.....

(c) The Reconstruction actually achieved: omissions from (b)  
 being due to faulty memory.

Thus doth it well appeare the salicke lawe  
 Was not deuised for the realme of France,  
 Vntill 400. one and twentie yeares  
 After the function of king Faramont,  
 Godly supposed the founder of this lawe:  
 Hugh Capet also that vsurpt the crowne,.....

This is quite definitely conjecture; but it is in agreement with the conclusions arrived at earlier from direct evidence, and it is in agreement with Hart's hypothesis.

## CHAPTER 2.

### THE STately SCENES IN ACT II.

It was upon an examination of Act II that Professors Pollard and Dover Wilson based the case for their 1919 hypothesis. In scene 4, which I shall consider first, they pointed to three passages in the Quarto which they held to have been interpolated in the 1593 abridged transcript by a pirate-actor.

1. The first six lines of the scene are a mere ruin:

King Now you Lords of Orleance,  
Of Bourbon, and of Berry,  
You see the King of England is not slacke,  
For he is footed on this land already.  
Dolphin My gracious Lord, 'tis meet we all go forth,  
And arme vs against the foe:

We have here a clear indication of memorial transmission in addition to the poorness of the structure; the fourth line is a direct anticipation of F II iv 149. Immediately after this passage, the standard of the Quarto text rises, the Dolphin's speech proceeding with eight perfectly metrical lines corresponding to the Folio much more nearly than any part of the above-quoted passage.

2. In Exeter's speech beginning 'Bloody constraint, for if you hide the crown' (Q lines 51-63, F lines 102-117) the first five and the last three of the Quarto version are correct in metre and verse-lining, and reproduce almost exactly the corresponding material in the Folio. There are only two variants: (a) Q line 55 "compell it:", F line 106 "compell.": (b) Q line 63 "we", F line 117 "I". On the other hand there lies between these two patches of satisfactory text a passage which is obviously very corrupt:

And on your heads turnes he the widowes teares,  
 The Orphanes cries, the dead mens bones,  
 The pining maidens grones.  
 For husbands, fathers, and distressed louers,  
 Which shall be swallowed in this controuersie.

As compared with the Folio there is a lacuna of three and a half lines between Q lines 55 and 56: i.e. F lines 107-110a ("And bids you.....his vastie lawes") are omitted in Q altogether. The Pollard-Wilson contention is that F lines 107-114 were cut in the 1593 abridgement (i.e. "And bids you.....swallowed in this Controuersie"). The pirate-actor tried to fill in the gap, but succeeded only imperfectly; it is not completely filled, and what is inserted is of poor quality.

3. The last five lines in the Q version of the scene are also attributed to the pirate-actor:

Now he wayes time euen to the latest graine,  
 Which you shall finde in your owne losses  
 If he stay in France.

King Well for vs, you shall returne our answere backe  
 To our brother England.

The words "our brother England" give away the memorial nature of the transmission at this point; they do not occur here in the Folio version, but they do occur in two earlier passages in the scene, viz. F line 120 (not in Q) and line 80 (reproduced in Q).

This disposes of all serious cases of metrical and structural corruption in the Quarto text of this scene. It should be pointed out that if we regard these three passages as interpolations and the basic stratum as the transcript of an abridgement it is almost necessary to postulate that the additions at

the beginning and end of the scene were substituted for material which the interpolator cancelled; otherwise the scene would begin and end with impossible abruptness, which it would be dangerous to attribute to a professional in the theatre who had the full text before him. Professors Pollard and Wilson, however, argue that in the abridgement the preliminary talk between the members of the French court was shortened from 79 lines (as in F) to 23 (for of the Quarto's 29 the pirate-actor supplied the first six). They proceed to a full reconstruction of the process of abridgement. Exeter's speeches were too important to be severely cut: two single lines are saved, viz. F line 88 ("By Custome, and the Ordinance of Times") and F line 127 ("Doe not in graunt of all demands at large"): the latter case involves an adjustment, for while the Folio construction is "if your Highnesse / doe not...." that of the Quarto is "Vnlesse your Highness.....". There is also the eight-line cut already referred to (F lines 107-114). Seven lines were cut at the end of the scene (F "Dispatch vs with all speed,.....of this consequence"); these are not represented at all in Q, except that the pirate-actor used one of them (For he is footed in this Land already) in his addition at the beginning of the scene. And lastly, there is the cut of two and a half lines in Exeter's last speech (F lines 143b-145: "now he weighs.....if he stay in France") which the pirate-actor filled up.

On the assumption that the original stratum of the Q 'copy' was a transcript it was possible to consider serious metrical



and structural corruption as in itself an adequate criterion of piratical interpolation, especially when the corrupt passages also contained other evidences of memorial transmission such as 'anticipations' or 'recollections'. But we have come to the conclusion that the Q text is a memorial reconstruction throughout, and that defective metre is not in itself sufficient reason for assigning a passage to an interpolator. If there are two strata of text, and if both are derived from memorial reconstruction, marks of defective memorial transmission may characterise the first stratum as well as the second. It is doubtful, therefore, whether we can regard the three passages set out above as interpolations at all.

Apart, however, from these passages the Q text of this scene is of a very high quality and corresponds quite closely to the Folio. This would seem to justify the theory of a basic transcript. But the evidence points to a completely different hypothesis.

Consider the following figures:

II iv.

			Q	F
No. of lines before Exeter's entry	..	..	29	79
No. of lines after Exeter's entry	..	..	61	73

i.e. before Exeter's entry Q represents approximately 37% of the Folio material, while after that entry it represents approximately 84%.

Now of the 29 lines found in Q before Exeter's entry, 10 reproduce the corresponding Folio line with no greater discrepancy

than a single word; while of the 61 lines in Q after his entry 41 reproduce the corresponding Folio line with the same degree of accuracy; i.e. before Exeter's entry only 38% of the Q material is, using that measure, accurately reported, while after his entry the figure is 67%. Thus there is both a quantitative and a qualitative distinction between the two portions of the Quarto version of the scene which are separated by Exeter's entry. Very much less of the Folio material is represented before that entry than after it; and the standard of approximation to the Folio is very much lower before it than after.

I suggest that these facts constitute prima facie evidence that an actor who had taken the part of Exeter was concerned in the memorial transmission of the Quarto text.

The condition of the speeches of other characters spoken while Exeter is on the stage tends to corroborate this hypothesis. There are very few: in the Folio the King of France has four, of which three are single-line speeches, the other comprising three lines: the Dolphin has two speeches, one of a line and a bit, the other of five lines. In Q the King's three-line speech is omitted, and we can say that its omission is due rather to imperfect memorial transmission than to abridgement for 'Exeter' remembered part of it in the wrong place: the last line of the scene runs in the Folio:

To morrow shall you know our mind at full.

This phrasing is not reproduced at all in the Quarto, which has

instead:

Well for vs, you shall returne our answere backe  
To our brother England.

The material of which this is composed is found in the earlier speech omitted by Q:

For vs, we will consider of this further:  
To morrow shall you beare our full intent  
Back to our brother of England.

(F II iv 118-120).

So 'Exeter' is very shaky with the King of France's speeches: nor is his version of the Dolphin's five-line speech ('Say that my father render faire reply....') conspicuously successful.

But the condition of his own speeches is excellent: he speaks 57 lines in F, 49 in Q; and at only three points in Q is the construction defective:- (1) lines 57-8 ('The Orphanes cries, the dead mens bones,/The pining maydens grones.'): (2) line 72, where owing to the substitution of 'vaultes' for the F 'vaultages' the line is two syllables short: (3) lines 85-88 ('Betweene his yonger dayes.....stay in France').

In Chapter 1 we argued for the existence of an abridgement behind the Quarto: it may be that the absence of Exeter's last speech in Q ('Dispatch vs with all speed.....') is due to abridgement. But just as we found traces of the omitted scene in Act I, so here one line is found at the beginning of the scene ('For he is footed....'). On the other hand, there is no reason to believe it impossible that an actor should forget a line or two of his own part.

Act II Scene ii.

We have decided that 'Exeter' was implicated in the memorial reconstruction which forms the basis of the Quarto 'copy'. This being so, we should not expect to find any speech of Exeter's wrongly assigned. But this is precisely what we do find, and that at the very beginning of the scene. Q lines 3-6 run:

I but the man that was his bedfellow  
Whom he hath cloyed and graced with princely fauours  
That he should for a forraine purse, to sell  
His Soueraignes life to death and trechery.

In the Folio (lines 8-11) this is assigned to Exeter, in the Quarto to Gloucester. This looks like a mistake in Q; and as it is the last sort of mistake we should expect 'Exeter' to make if he were reporting the play, it would appear to be fatal to our case.

But of the eleven lines in the Folio before the entry of the King and the three traitors the only lines accurately reproduced in the Quarto (which has seven lines here) are those which in F are spoken by Exeter. These are almost completely accurate in Q; discounting the variant Q 'to' (l. 5) F 'so' (l. 10) which may be due to the compositor, the differences are these:- (1) Q line 3 'I', F line 8 'Nay' (2) Q line 4 'cloyed and graced with princely', F line 9 'dull'd and cloy'd with gracious'. This latter variation is probably due to memorial transmission: Q 'graced' contains an anticipation of the

nearly-related word 'gracious' later in the same F line. And inversion is a common feature of reported texts.

Of this eleven-line passage in the Folio, then, the speeches assigned in that text to Exeter are accurately reproduced in Q. As for the remainder, the only other F line represented at all in Q is Bedford's opening line, assigned to Gloucester, which has lost its metrical structure altogether:

Before God my Lord, his Grace is too bold to trust these  
traytors.

The rest is omitted altogether, i.e. Westmoreland's three-line speech (F lines 3-5) and Bedford's two-line speech (F lines 6-7). In addition one line occurs in Q, not found in F, and assigned to Exeter: viz. Q line 7 -- 'O the Lord of Masham' (i.e. indicating that character's approach).

So far from demolishing the Exeter-theory these circumstances tend to strengthen it. I suggest the following as a reasonable hypothesis: in a scene in which 'Exeter' had only a subordinate part he remembered at the beginning only the introductory line (very imperfectly) and his own lines (nearly perfectly). This material he set down on his page. But he found that, owing to his imperfect memory and his consequent omissions, two speeches of his own were awkwardly juxtaposed:

Exeter They shall be apprehended by and by.  
Ay, but the man that was his bedfellow.....

So in order to avoid this difficulty 'Exeter' simply assigned the speech 'I but the man etc' -- his own speech, and therefore well-remembered -- to the other character who was on the stage



with him, i.e. in the Quarto Gloucester.

We believe that Westmoreland's part was cut in the stage-abridgement underlying Q (see Chapter 1); so the speech "How smooth and euen they do bear themselues.....and constant loyalty" (F lines 3-5) was probably absent from the abridgement. But there is still in the Folio version a two-line speech by Bedford which serves to separate the two speeches of Exeter. It is not unreasonable to assume that 'Exeter' forgot these two lines.

Now why does Q make Gloucester Exeter's partner, and not Bedford as in the Folio?

Bedford appears in F in only two scenes in the entire play -- II ii and IV iii: and he says very little. Gloucester appears in F in four scenes -- III vi, IV i, IV iii, and IV vii. So in only one scene in the Folio version are these two characters on the stage at the same time, viz. IV iii. In that scene Bedford speaks altogether four and a half lines; Gloucester has only the words "Where is the King?" in the first line of the scene. An abridger could easily make the two characters into one. I suggest that in the stage-abridgement which we know to underlie the Quarto Gloucester took over Bedford's speeches and delivered them in addition to his own.<sup>1</sup> We know that the

---

1. At IV iii 7-9 in Q a three-line speech delivered by Bedford in F is given to Clarence, though Gloucester is on the stage and speaks only two lines. The assignation of speeches is very confused in the later portions of Q, so that/

abridger had already dispensed with two other small-part characters -- Ely and Westmoreland (see Chapter 1).

The explanation of the conditions in the Quarto text before the King's entry is therefore as follows: the abridger made Gloucester speak the first line of the scene (as in Q) in place of Bedford (as in F). Exeter replied as in the full text. Westmoreland's three-line speech was excised in the abridgement. Bedford's two-line speech was assigned by the abridger to Gloucester, but the reporter ('Exeter') completely forgot it. Then came the four-line speech of Exeter which he set down accurately but which he was forced to assign to Gloucester in order to preserve coherence (as described above).

The next difficulty is presented by the curious line "O the Lord of Masham" which is peculiar to the Quarto. This ejaculation would seem to imply that the King entered accompanied not by three lords, but by one -- Masham, i.e. Scroope. Actually, of course, the three enter, as in the Folio.

Now in the Folio, just after Exeter's formal speech arresting the three exposed traitors (F lines 145-150) each delivers a short speech. Scroope has four lines, Cambridge has six, and Gray has five; then comes the King's "God quit you in his

---

that this is not necessarily an objection to the theory that in the abridgement Gloucester took Bedford's part: this assignation to Clarence may be an error. Even if it is correct, it merely means that Bedford's part was re-distributed in the abridgement, different speeches being given to different characters.

mercy" (F line 166). In Q, Exeter's speech is given exactly, except that we have "Henry, Lord of Masham" instead of "Thomas Lord Scroope of Marsham (sic)" as in F. Masham's four-line speech is given in Q with complete accuracy except for one variation -- Q "your maiestie", F "your Highnesse to". The speeches of Cambridge and Gray are totally absent: Henry's "God quit you" therefore follows immediately on Masham's four lines. It is, to say the least, extraordinary that 'Exeter' should remember Masham's speech almost perfectly and yet utterly forget the speeches of Cambridge and Gray so that he could not even attempt a very imperfect reconstruction of any part of them.

Similar conditions exist at another point in the Quarto version of this scene. Lines 59 ff. run as follows:

The mercy which was quit in vs but late,	
By your owne reasons is forestalde and done:	
You must not dare for shame to aske for mercy,	
For your owne conscience turne vpon your bosomes,	
As dogs vpon their masters worrying them.	5
See you my Princes, and my noble Peeres,	
These English monsters:	
My Lord of Cambridge here,	
You know how apt we were to grace him,	
In all things belonging to his honour:	10
And this vilde man hath for a few light crownes,	
Lightly conspired and sworne vnto the practises of France:	
To kill vs here in Hampton. To the which	
This knight no lesse in bountie bound to vs	
Then Cambridge is, hath likewise sworne.	15
But oh, what shall I say to thee false man,	
Thou cruell ingratefull and inhumane creature,	
Thou that didst beare the key of all my counsell,	
That knewest the very secrets of my heart,	19
etc. etc.	

In this passage there is an essential difference in character

between lines 1-5 and 16-19 on the one hand, and the intervening lines on the other. On the one hand we have perfect metrical construction, on the other very faulty conditions of metre and line-division. Of the ten lines in the intermediate patch of text only four are metrically regular, and these four are not consecutive. And the curious thing is that the defective passage is that concerning Cambridge and Gray, while simultaneously with the taking up of the case of Masham (line 16 above) metrical conditions pick up at once and greater approximation to the Folio begins again. The reporter 'Exeter' is very markedly shakier with the portions involving Cambridge and Gray than with those implicating Masham.

I suggest that behind the Quarto text of this scene we catch a glimpse of a severely abridged version of the play in which the three traitors were reduced to one. But I do not mean that 'Exeter' was trying to reconstruct the scene as that abridgement had it. On the contrary he was obviously trying to reconstruct a "three-traitor" version. He knew both a fuller version and an abridgement in which the number of actors required had been drastically reduced. But he knew the abridged version better than the fuller version, and this affected his reconstruction of the latter.

A similar conclusion emerges from an examination of another passage in the same scene in the Quarto. In F II ii 39-59 an effective dramatic point is made by the King's reference to the release of the "man committed yesterday / That rayled against

our person" and the uncompromising attitude of the three lords who are themselves worse traitors. The passage is an entity in that it could be removed without damaging the sequence. The corresponding passage in the Quarto is lines 24-42.

Now in the first 23 lines of the scene in Q there are 19 lines absolutely regular from the point of view of metre and line-division. Of the remaining four, one is in the nature of an 'extra metrum' ejaculation (line 7: 'O the Lord of Masham') and may therefore be disregarded: one is faulty only in that it includes one and a half lines in a single line of print (line 14: 'Neuer was Monarch better feared and loued then is your maiestie'): only two lines out of the whole 23 are really corrupt in metrical construction, viz. line 1 ('Before God my Lord, his Grace is too bold to trust these traytors') and line 19 ('Sooner then reward and merit'). Line 1 has already been explained; line 14 is spoken by Cambridge.

Then, beginning with line 24 comes the passage dealing with the release of the agitator. It comprises 18 lines, of which nine are seriously corrupt in either metre or line-division. These nine lines fall into two distinct groups:

1. Defective Metre:

lines 25-6: Committed yesterday, that railed against  
our person,  
We consider it was the heate of wine that  
set him on,

lines 29-30: Let him be punisht Soueraigne, least the  
example of him  
Breed more of such a kinde. O let vs yet  
be mercifull.



2. Regular Metre, with faulty line-division:

lines 37-41:

If little faults proceeding on distemper/should not be  
winked at  
How should we stretch our eye/when capitall crimes  
Chewed, swallowed and digested,/appeare before vs:  
We'll yet enlarge the man,/ tho Cambridge and the rest  
In their deare loues/and tender preservation of our state,/  
The diagonals show that only re-division is necessary to  
produce a perfectly metrical passage; and comparison of  
this with the corresponding passage in F will show that  
the reproduction is of quite a high standard. There is  
no metrical corruption at all; six metrical lines are  
crowded into five lines of print.

It is possible to say straight away, without referring to any hypothetical considerations of stratification, that the transmitter of the Quarto text felt decidedly uncomfortable about this passage concerning the rowdy demonstrator. The quality of the text deteriorates suddenly at this point. The same hypothesis as that outlined already would satisfactorily explain this circumstance. 'Exeter' had recently acted in an abridged version of the play; he also knew (though not nearly so well) the full version (substantially as found in F); attempting here to reconstruct the full version he was least successful with the passages which had been cut in the abridgement, of which this passage about the "man committed yesterday" was probably one.

We have seen that metrical deficiency is not in itself an adequate reason for supposing a passage to be an interpolation in the Q 'copy'. But faulty line-division of a perfectly metrical passage is in a different category. Where six metrical lines are crowded into the space of five, the reason may be that they were written on a page of MS. which was already filled, so that there was insufficient space in which to set them down as six lines. The mislined patch in our passage ("If little faults.....preservation of our state") may therefore be an interpolation. This view is corroborated when we consider that the patch in question is a piece of general moralising: is it likely that the reporter, struggling along in vain with that part of the passage about the demonstrator which actually does concern the situation in this scene, should recover and write six absolutely metrical lines when the general moral is drawn? We might legitimately expect it to be the other way round. And even if the reporter did do this, why should he misdivide his six metrical lines: he manages correct line-division at other points where he achieves metrical regularity. But the theory of interpolation gives a perfectly satisfactory mechanical explanation of this mislining.

It might be argued that only this mislined passage (Q lines 37-41) was cut in the stage-abridgement and that the rest of the account of the demonstrator was present in it. But this contention ignores the very poor structure of the whole passage under discussion. We are entitled to ask why the quality of

the text deteriorates so suddenly as soon as the description of this episode begins (i.e. at Q line 25). It seems much more plausible to argue that 'Exeter's' poor knowledge of this passage (F lines 39-59) is symptomatised not only by structural defects but by omission. The omission was rectified by an interpolator. And the full hypothesis is that 'Exeter' had acted in an abridgement in which the whole episode of the disturber of the peace had been excised, that he had also some acquaintance with the full version as found in the Folio, that he was trying to reconstruct the latter, that he could deal much less efficiently with the episode which had been omitted in the abridgement, and that this is signalled by defective structure and by an omission which was later filled in.

Striking confirmation of the theory that an actor who had played the part of Exeter was concerned in the preparation of the 'copy' for the Quarto is provided by the scenes late in the play in which Exeter appears. The latter part of the play would give a reporter considerable difficulty: and there is a good deal of confusion in the Quarto.

But let us look at Act IV scene vi. The bulk of this scene comprises a long and difficult speech by Exeter. Q reproduces this admirably. Step by step it runs parallel with the Folio version. In Q it amounts to 24 lines; of these no less than 17 (i.e. approx. 71%) reproduce the corresponding Folio line with no greater discrepancy than a single word. And there are no grounds here for suspecting transcription. Because

half a line has been forgotten (the end of F IV vi 25: "and kist his lippes") the line-division of the next four is faulty. This could hardly have happened if the transmission had been by transcription from some theatrical manuscript; the half-line might have been carelessly omitted, but there would be no reason for the succeeding mislining. Also important are several cases where Q has a more commonplace expression than F:

Q line 17	flie to rest	F line 17	flye a-brest
" 21	He tooke me by the hand	" 21	raught me his hand
" 26	neuer ending loue	" 27	Noble-ending-loue

Such readings in Q are probably the result of defective memorial transmission, and are not lightly to be set down as the readings of a first sketch. And one case substantiates this, in that it involves metrical deficiency in Q: viz. line 12 --

Q Comes to him where in blood he lay steept

F Comes to him, where in gore he lay insteeped.

We cannot postulate transcription, nor access to the player's 'part'; the evidence rather indicates memorial reconstruction of a high standard.

Exeter appears also in I ii, IV iii, and IV viii: his own part is not very big in any of these scenes, all of which contain long and often rhetorical speeches by other characters. But all are represented in the Quarto with remarkable fullness.

The reporting of V ii is not of a high standard, even when Exeter is on: but it is noticeable that Exeter's one speech is given in the Quarto absolutely accurately (except for the minor

variant Q E heare F Heretere) (V ii Q 119-128, F 336-342:

"Only he hath not subscribed this.....Et heres Francie").<sup>1</sup>

- 
1. Price may well be right in supposing that a fragment of authentic manuscript underlies this "difficult piece of Latin and French" (The Text of Henry V, p.19). But at no other point in Exeter's part can this be assumed.



CHAPTER 3.

---

ACT II: THE LONDON HUMOURS SCENES.

An examination of these scenes, along with III ii, has persuaded me that in the memorial reconstruction of the play 'Exeter' had a collaborator. That collaborator was an actor who had at some time played the part of Mrs Quickly.

### Section 1.

Let us begin with II iii. We find points of interest right at the beginning of the scene. Mrs Quickly speaks the first line; then Pistol has a speech. In Q Mrs Quickly's line is reproduced fairly well: the variations are not serious:-

Q I prethy  
sweete heart  
so far as

F 'Prythee  
honey sweet Husband  
to

But this line is followed by a miserable effort at reproducing Pistol's reply. F reads thus:-

No: for my manly heart doth erne. Bardolph be blythe:  
Nim, rowse thy vaunting Veines: Boy, brissle thy Courage  
vp: for Falstaffe hee is dead, and we must erne there-  
fore.

All that the Quarto has is "No fur, no fur" (line 2). It is possible, as Professors Pollard and Dover Wilson pointed out, that whoever transmitted this part of the text was totally ignorant of Pistol's speech, recollecting only the sound at the beginning and not the meaning. As some reply was obviously necessary from Pistol, the reporter set this down, perhaps meaning to fill it up later if he could. But Price points out (Text of Henry V, pp. 19-20) that "fur" is "a recognised

comparative of the adverb 'far'.....It is a direct answer to Mrs Quickly's request: 'Let me bring thee so farre as Stanes'. The Quarto simply preserves for us a piece of actor's gag." This may be so; but the fact remains that the person responsible for this portion of the Quarto text could not reproduce Pistol's speech here. And this is the point that will concern us.

This speech of Pistol's is followed by one from Bardolph. F reads:

Would I were with him, wheresomere he is, eyther in  
Heauen or in Hell.

To which Mrs Quickly replies, in natural sequence:

Nay sure, hee's not in Hell: hee's in Arthurs Bosome.....  
In Q, however, Bardolph's speech (line 3) runs:

Well sir Iohn is gone. God be with him.

This is followed by Mrs Quickly's rejoinder:

I, he is in Arthurs bosom.....

It seems obvious that the initial 'I' here is an adaptation, made to follow a sentiment different from the original. Q virtually loses the whole point, but intelligible sequence is preserved by the alteration of 'Nay sure' to 'I'. There can hardly be any question of a 'first sketch' here. It is most probable that the reporter utterly failed to remember the words of Bardolph's speech, as he had previously failed with that of Pistol. But here it was easy for him to supply words of his own invention: for clearly Bardolph was making some comment on the death

of Falstaff. So the reporter put down a conventional comment: 'Well sir Iohn is gone. God be with him' -- a comment quite out of tune with what Bardolph would be likely to say! And he adapted the next line to fit this.

Now comes the first long speech of the scene, spoken by Mrs Quickly. A glance at the parallel-text edition shows that the bulk of this speech is reproduced by no means badly in Q: there are a few omissions and a few verbal substitutions;

Omissions: hee's not in Hell  
 a made a finer end  
 a parted euen..  
 and a Table of greene fields (sic in F)  
 what man? be a good cheere  
 .....or foure.....

I put my hand into the Bed  
 (The first omission is necessary in the adaptation of the speech to follow on the Q version of the previous one.)

Verbal Substitutions: these are for the most part insignificant.

Q he is F hee's  
 Q if euer any were F if euer man went to Arthur's Bosome  
 Q as if it were F and it had beene  
 Q when F after  
 Q talk of F play with  
 Q no way but one F but one way  
 Q bad him not think F bid him a should not think  
 Q no such need F no neede to trouble himselfe with any  
 such thoughts yet

Q Then he F So a

Q at his feete F on his feete

Q ends F end.

This is the longest, and by no means the least difficult, in the whole scene: I think we may claim that the standard of the reporting is quite high.

The first five lines of the dialogue which follows Mrs Quickly's long speech are verbally accurate except for the variant Q 'No' F 'Nay', the substitution in Q of 'he' for F's 'a', and the inclusion in Q of one 'he' to which there is no corresponding word in F. Mrs Quickly takes part in this dialogue, of course. There is one erroneous assignation: the words "And of women" are assigned to 'Bard.' in F, to 'Boy' in Q.

In Mrs Quickly's next speech there is an omission involving some readjustment: F has "A could neuer abide Carnation, 'twas a Colour he neuer liked", while Q reads "Indeed carnation was a colour he neuer loued". Both this and the other example of tinkering ('I he is in Arthurs bosome') occur in Mrs Quickly's part. The reporter makes every effort to produce coherent sequence in this part, in contradistinction for example to the Bardolph 'No fur, no fur'.

After Mrs Quickly's 'carnation' speech, F has the following:

Boy A said once, the Deule would haue him about women.  
Mrs Q A did in some sort (indeed) handle Women: but  
 then hee was rumatique, and talked of the Whore  
 of Babylon.



In place of this Q reads:

Nim Well he did cry out on women  
Mrs Q Indeed he did in some sort handle women,  
 But then he was rumaticke, and talkt of the whore of  
 Babylon.

Three things call for notice: (1) the speech preceding Mrs Quickly's is wrongly assigned in Q, (2) Mrs Quickly's speech is absolutely accurate except for the position of 'indeed' and the substitution of 'he' for 'a', (3) the words assigned to Nim are merely a recollection of an earlier passage, found in both texts:

Nim They say he cryed out of Sack  
Mrs Q I, that a did.  
Nim And of (Q on) Women.  
Mrs Q Nay, that a did not.

So, while Mrs Quickly's words are presented with absolute accuracy, the remark which occasions them is wrongly assigned and merely repeats the substance of a passage which occurs some lines earlier. We are finding repeatedly that while Mrs Quickly's part is on the whole well reported, the rest is poorly reported; we have discovered serious weaknesses with Pistol, Bardolph, and now Nim.

We have already seen that the reporter knows little of the part of Bardolph. At line 3 he assigned him the conventional remark "God be with him" for which there is no justification in the authentic text. The next speech which the Quarto assigns to Bardolph runs thus:

Bar. Well, God be with him,  
 That was all the wealth I got in his seruice.

This is unintelligible: we have to go to the Folio:

Well, the fuell is gone that maintain'd that fire: that's all the Riches I got in his seruice.

Once again we have an indication of how little the reporter knew of Bardolph's part: he can only repeat the conventional remark he introduced earlier, and, because he remembers the second part of the speech accurately, the result is an incoherent speech in Q. It can be stated quite emphatically from the evidence of this scene that of the four parts that of which the reporter knew least is the part of Bardolph. Professors Pollard and Wilson chose the actor of that part as the agent responsible for the interpolation of the tavern-scenes in the Q 'copy': surely it is clear that 'Bardolph' can have nothing to do with the piracy.

The Q version of Pistol's last speech ('Cleare vp thy cristalles...') is not too bad, apart from certain omissions; but this does not alter the significance of the pathetic "No fur, no fur" at the beginning. Similarly Nim's last two speeches (both very short) are perfect as they stand in Q:

Shall we shog off?

The king wil be gone from Southampton.

and

I cannot kis: and theres the humor of it.  
But adieu.

But against this we have to set the fact that earlier in the scene Nim is assigned a speech which does not belong to him, and that that speech is merely a re-hash of material in which Nim has been implicated before.

On the one hand therefore we have the weakness of the parts of Pistol, Bardolph, and Nim; on the other the comparative excellence of that of Mrs Quickly. I have no doubt that an actor who had played the part of Mrs Quickly was concerned in the reconstruction which underlies the Q 'copy'. So far as I know, this has not been seriously advanced before: but in the article by Professors Pollard and Wilson to which reference has several times been made it is stated that one of them inclined towards that view but that it was considered on the whole safer to assume that 'Bardolph' was the culprit.

#### Section 2: Traces of Verse in Prose-Scenes?

The latest critic, to my knowledge, to argue that behind Q lies a version of the play earlier than that found in F is Hardin Craig ('The Relation of the First Quarto Version to the First Folio Version of Shakespeare's Henry V', Philological Quarterly, vol. VI (1927), pp. 225-34). One of the most interesting points he raises is consequent on the work of A. E. Morgan. In an important essay entitled 'Some Problems of Shakespeare's Henry the Fourth' (pub. Shakespeare Association, 1924). Morgan maintains the following position: both parts of Henry IV, as we know them, are revised versions of earlier Shakespearian forms; these were based on the 'Oldcastle' version, which version and the Famous Victories were both independently derived from a yet earlier play or plays which existed by 1588. The matter which concerns

us here is Morgan's claim that embedded in comic prose scenes of the Henry IV plays are traces of verse: the 'Oldcastle' version was, he maintains, almost wholly a verse-play: Shakespeare has made the comic scenes into prose, leaving however traces of the earlier verse-form. See pp. 23 seq. of Morgan's essay.

Now Hardin Craig states that in Q Henry V much of the material in the realistic and comic (as opposed to the stately) scenes can, despite the corruption of the text, be read as verse; and he would regard the relationship borne by the version underlying Q to that of F as roughly corresponding to the relationship of the 'Oldcastle' plays to Shakespeare's 1 & 2 Henry IV on Morgan's hypothesis.

Hardin Craig refers particularly to two examples of passages from prose-scenes, where he sees traces of verse despite the corruption of the Q text:

1. Q II iii 4 ff.:

I, he is in Arthurs bosom, if euer any were:  
 He went away as if it were a crysombd childe,  
 Betweenetwelve and one,  
 Iust at turning of the tide:  
 His nose was as sharpe as a pen:  
 For when I saw him fumble with the sheets,  
 And talk of floures, and smile vpon his fingers ends  
 I knew there was no way but one.  
 How now sir Iohn quoth I?  
 And he cryed three times, God, God, God,  
 Now I to comfort him, bad him not think of God,  
 I hope there was no such need.  
 Then he bad me put more cloathes at his feete:  
 And I felt to them, and they were as cold as any stone:  
 And to his knees, and they were as cold as any stone.  
 And so vpward, and vpward, and all was as cold as any stone.

## 2. Q IV i 81-7:

Euery mans seruice is the kings:  
 But euery mans soule is his owne.  
 Therefore I would haue euery souldier examine himselfe,  
 And wash euery moath out of his conscience:  
 That in so doing, he may be the readier for death:  
 Or not dying, why the time was well spent,  
 Wherein such preparation was made.

I cannot think that Hardin Craig has a strong foundation here for his hypothesis: everyone is familiar with the way in which groups of words in a prose passage occasionally fall into regular rhythms, so that a succession of words sounds like a line of verse. I cannot think that more than this is involved in the above passages. Morgan's examples from the two Henry IV plays appear to me infinitely more convincing.

Section 3: Act II Scene i.

It remains to test the conclusions of Section 1 of the present chapter by considering the other tavern scene in the same Act. The main point to settle is whether the standard of reporting is definitely higher when Mrs Quickly is on the stage than when she is off. A careful comparison of the Q and F texts shows that this is so. The corruption due to faulty memorial transmission is very much more serious at the two points where Mrs Quickly is absent. The evidence will be set forth in detail.

Mrs Quickly is absent from the stage (a) during the first twenty lines of the scene (Q numbering) and (b) between line 68 and line 89 (also Q numbering).



- A. List of Variations from the F text while Mrs Quickly is  
on the Stage.

The line-numbering is that of the Nicholson-Daniel  
 Parallel Text edition.

<u>line</u>	Q	<u>line</u>	F
21	Godmorrow ancient Pistoll	--	--
	--	25	and his wife
22	I prithee Nim be quiet	26	good Corporall be patient heere.
23	How do you my Hoste? (spoken by Nim)		How now mine Hoaste Pistoll? (spoken by Bardolph).
24	slaue	28	Tyke
25	by gads lugges		by this hand
	title	29	terme
26	lodging	30	Lodgers
27	not I	31	not long
28	bed nor boord	32	lodge and board
	half a score honest gentlewomen		a dozen or fourteene Gentle- women
29	needle	33	Needles
30	it is thought straight....		it will be thought....straight
31-2	O Lord heeres Corporall Nims, now shall/We haue	34-5	O welliday Lady, if he be not hewne now, we shall see
	Q omits Bardolph's speech, F 37 ('Good Lieutenant...nothing heere')		
	Q tacks Mrs Q.'s speech ('Good Corporall Nim shew thy valour...') on to the end of her previous speech.		
Q 33	the valour of a man	F 41	thy valour
36	What dost thou push,	39	Pish for thee, Island dogge:

Pistol's speech "Solus, egregious dog?.....flashing fire will follow.":-

Q omits some of the F material, but is in itself admirably intelligible; and everything in the Q speech is in the F version, with the following variations:

Q	messfull	F	nastie
	that solus		the solus
	and in thy Iaw		yea in thy Maw
	talke		take (sic)
	P's flashing firy cocke		P's cocke is vp, and
	is up		flashing fire will
			follow

And the Q order is that of F, except for the position of the phrase "and in thy Iaw perdy".

<u>line</u>	Q	<u>line</u>	F
44	Pistoll	--	
45	And you fall foule	51	If you grow fowle
	Ile		I will
	--	53	as I may
46	will	53	would
	a little	--	
47	Ile	54	I would
	--	55	as I may
48	theres	55	that's
50	groaning Death	57	doting death
	--	59	heare me what I say
52	blow	60	stroake
53	Ile kill him		Ile rum him vp to the hiltis

Q omits Pistol's speech "Giue me thy fist.....most tall".

55	Ile...your...at one.. or an	65	I will...thy...one....or
	other		other

Q  
line

56 And theres

--

I thee defie

58 A damned hound

59-60 to the powdering tub of  
infamy,/Fetch forth....

63 there it is inough

64 Hostes.....And you  
Host P.

straight

Q omits "He is very sicke, & would to bed."

66 nose

the sheetes

Q omits "Faith, he's very ill" and "Away you Rogue".

Q omits "The King has kild his heart".

68 Ile go to him, husband  
youle come?

After Mrs Quickly's re-entry:-

89 you came of men come in

90 Sir Iohn poore soule is  
so troubled with

91 tashan contagian feuer  
tis wonderfull

F  
line

66 that is

67 that

I defie thee

68 O hound of Creet

69 to the spittle go, and from  
the Poudering tub of  
infamy, fetch forth.....

73 there's enough to go to.

74 Mine Hoast P.....and your  
(sic) Hostesse

--

76 face

his sheets

81 Good Husband come home pre-  
sently.

107 you come of women, come in  
quickly to sir Iohn

108 A poore heart, he is so  
shak'd of

109 quotidian Tertian

that it is most lamentable  
to behold

Q omits the passage 'Sweet men.....humors and carreeres'.

I believe this to be a complete census of differences between the Q and the F in Act II scene 1 while Mrs Quickly is on the stage. An examination of the list shows that, considering that the text is a reported one, the variations from the authentic full version are very slight; the standard of reporting is, I would say, extremely high. And it must be remembered that in the list there are cases where Q is undoubtedly right and F wrong, e.g. F's take (line 48) for talke (as in Q), and F's your Hostesse (line 75) for you, Hostesse (cf. Q 'And you Host Pistoll'). There is a case where Q may well preserve an original reading altered before publication of F in accordance with the law against blasphemy, namely Q's by gads lugges (Q line 25) compared with the Folio's colourless by this hand. And at least two of the Q corruptions may be laid to the printer's charge, namely the occurrence of the word 'Pistoll' in Q line 44 and the phrase 'a little' in line 46: each of these also occurs in Q in the immediately following line (45 and 47 respectively) and each occurs in the Folio in the latter positions. Both cases lie very near each other, and it may safely be assumed that the Q 'copy' was at this point a little tangled so that twice the printer's eye caught a word in the line after that which he was setting up. So the above list should, from the point of view of the reporting itself, be somewhat shortened.

Throughout the passages we have examined the Q follows the Folio in due order, with perfect coherence, and with no serious corruption. There is naturally some omission and some verbal

substitution; but the high standard of reporting can be gauged from the fact that the most serious corruptions are (1) the assignation to Nim of a non-committal phrase of Bardolph's, viz. Q "How do you, my Hoste?" and (2) the tacking on of a short speech of Mrs Quickly's to her previous long speech: apart from this the only corruptions of order are trifling -- a single word or a single phrase at the most is out of order when compared with F.

At Q line 68 Mrs Quickly leaves the stage, returning at Q line 88. Obviously the actor cannot have been far away in the interval. Thus if Mrs Quickly were the reporter he would be expected to know almost as much about this section as about those parts of the scene where he was himself on the stage. And the standard of the passage in question is high. Even so, it is interesting to note that this passage contains a corruption (clearly due to imperfect memory) much more serious than any which occurs when Mrs Quickly is actually present. Nim's question "I shall haue my eight shillings I wonne of you at beating?" occurs in place at Q line 72, and again in exactly the same form at line 79; the reporter obviously forgot Bardolph's speech "Corporall Nym, & thou wilt be friends.....prethee put up" and weakly fell back on a repetition of the previous question especially in view of Pistol's next words -- "A Noble shalt thou have.....".

Now if, on the other hand, we examine the corruption in the first twenty lines of the Q scene (i.e. before Mrs Quickly



and Pistol enter at all) we shall find that there is very much more serious corruption. Here is the list of cases:

1. Q line 1 Godmorrow Corporall Nim.  
F do. Well met Corporall Nim.

Q reading is an anticipation of the terms of the immediately following line.

2. Q line 4 I cannot tell, things must be as they may.

This anticipates F line 19, which it reproduces exactly. The reason for the anticipation was doubtless the occurrence of the phrase 'that shall be as it may' in F line 5 (i.e. the line corresponding to the Q line in question). The Q speech then takes up the F one from 'I dare not fight....' (Q line 5).

3. Q line 8 And theres the humor of it  
F line 9 and there's an end

The Q phrase recurs at line 14, again without warrant from the folio. In the latter text the phrase does not occur until line 55, a long way ahead. It is another anticipation.

4. There is a big transposition in Q. Bardolph's speech beginning 'Come yfaith, Ile bestow a breakfast....' followed (as in F) by Nim's speech beginning 'Yfaith Ile liue as long as I may..' occurs after, instead of before, the Bardolph speech beginning 'Yfaith mistresse quickly did thee great wrong...' followed (as in F) by Nim's speech 'I must do as I may, tho patience be a tyred mare....': the order of these two passages, of two speeches each, is reversed in the folio.

It is tempting to allow the possibility of one of these two passages being a subsequent interpolation, accidentally misplaced by interpolator or compositor. This would agree with the conclusions of chapter I; but in the absence of anything approaching direct evidence we have to take it rather as a case of pure memorial corruption.

5. The Q speech beginning "I must do as I may, tho patience be a tyred mare..." is reported clause by clause backwards. The order in the two texts is as follows:

Folio: (1) men may sleep, and they may have their throats about them at that time,

(2) and some say knives have edges:

(3) It must be as it may, though patience be a  
tired name (sic) yet she will plodde,

Quarto: (1) I must do as I may, tho patience be a tyred  
mare, Yet sheel plod,

(2) and some say knives have edges,

(3) And men may sleepe and have their throtes  
about them At that time,

F and Q read straight on -- (1) then (2) then (3) -- as  
above: F's (1) is Q's (3), and F's (3) is Q's (1).  
The reader may compare this with a similar phenomenon  
in the soliloquy 'O that this too much griev'd and  
sallied flesh' in Q1 Hamlet where the same reversal  
of the order of blocks of text is seen.

6. Q's lines 16-7: What a plague should we carrie knives / To  
cut our owne throats: do not occur here in F, but are  
anticipated from F lines 83-4, again a long way ahead.  
The mention of 'throats' in the phrase 'and have their  
throtes about them' (see no. 5) provides the memorial  
link.

These are the most striking corruptions in Q lines 1-20.  
It will be at once apparent that there is no corruption so  
serious as nos. 2-6 in those portions of the text where Mrs  
Quickly is on the stage: in those latter portions differences  
of sequence are negligible when compared to nos. 4 and 5 above;  
and there are there no anticipations such as we have traced in  
nos. 2, 3 and 6. And all six cases are of corruptions due to  
bad memory. Without a doubt we can say that the standard of  
reporting is far lower before Mrs Quickly enters than after.  
And this corroborates the results of our examination of Q Act II  
scene iii in Section 1 of this chapter.

Were we relying solely on the evidence of this scene all

that we might feel ourselves entitled to say might be that either Mrs Quickly or Pistol probably transmitted the text. As a matter of fact the condition of Pistol's speeches is on the whole excellent. But the condition of Q II iii has shown us that it is very much more likely to have been Mrs Quickly (see Section 1 of this chapter). And there is in the present scene one striking positive confirmation of this.

After Mrs Quickly's re-entry (Q line 89) all that is represented in Q is her speech and the final line spoken by Pistol; the Nym-Pistol conversation is omitted. There is no evidence suggesting that this or any other omission in this scene is the result of deliberate abridgement, and it is reasonable to postulate defective memory. We can hardly assume that if Pistol had been the reporter he would have forgotten the dialogue in which he himself had been involved while remembering Mrs Quickly's speech. That the condition of her speech (Q lines 89-91) is not as good as usual need not complicate the issue: a reporting actor may occasionally forget his exact words. I believe that the high standard of much of Pistol's material in this scene is quite credibly accounted for by Mrs Quickly's presence at these points.

An analysis of Act III scene ii, where Mrs Quickly is not present while Nim, Bardolph, Pistol and the Boy are, will be found in the next chapter: it fully corroborates the conclusions of this one.

CHAPTER 4.

---

ACT III.

Q omits scene 1; and for the moment I wish to leave aside scene 4, which is mainly in French. The remainder of the scenes in the Quarto version fall, when compared with the Folio, into three groups:

1. The text of scenes 2, 5 and 7 is very poorly reported.
2. The text of scene 6 is excellently reported, from the point of view of both quality and quantity.
3. Scene 3 is peculiar, in that while only 18 out of the Folio's 58 lines are represented, these lines are themselves practically perfect.

In scene 2 the characters present are Nim, Pistol, Bardolph and the Boy (Fluellen and Gower do not enter till the very end). The last scene in which these four characters appeared was Act II scene 3, and we have seen that the reporting of that scene is comparatively good. Practically all the material in the Folio is at least represented. But the Quarto version of Act III scene 2 is attenuated and debased to a much higher degree. The significant point is that Mrs Quickly is not present in III ii, while she is present in II iii.

Let us analyse the Q text of III ii. Nim begins the scene with the words "Before God, here is hot service". This takes the place of a much more extended speech in the Folio, a speech in which the word 'service' does not occur. "Hot" has its source in the Folio passage:

...the Knocks are too hot:.....the humour of it is too hot...  
 "Service is an anticipation of the beginning of scene 6:



I assure you, there is very excellent Services committed  
at the Bridge. (F III vi 3).

Pistol replies, taking up Nim's phrase, "'Tis hot indeed", and continues with only one line of the Folio version (which is, of course, a verse pattern, although printed as prose):

Blows (F Knocks) go and come, God's vassals drop and die.

The condition of Pistol's verse-speeches in Q is extremely interesting: we can see a defective memory at work. Take his second speech; Q has

.....If wishes would preuaile,  
I would not stay, but thither would I hie.

Compare this with the Folio version:

If wishes would prevail with me,  
My purpose would not fail with me,  
But thither would I hie.

The Q pirate, whoever he was, has forgotten most of Pistol's words: he has remembered that Pistol speaks in these verse-patterns, but he has quite forgotten the complex metrical design actually used. All that he can do is to manufacture a flat pentameter. Not only is the original verse-form lost, but the presence of the word 'prevail' which had a place in the original rhyme-scheme bears witness to the utter ruin of that original.

The third verse-speech of Pistol is as great a ruin, and it is assigned to Nim. In F it runs: (the metrical form restored):

Be merciful, great Duke, to men of mould!  
Abate thy rage, abate thy manly rage!  
Abate thy rage, great Duke,  
Good bawcock, bate thy rage!  
Use lenity, sweet chuck!

Again the transmitter of the Quarto text remembers that Pistol

speaks in verse, but again he forgets the verse-pattern and most of the words as well. Once more he manufactures a pentameter out of what little of the speech he can recollect:

Abate thy rage, sweet knight, abate thy rage.

This definitely excludes the possibility of an actor of the part of Pistol having been concerned in the transmission of the Q text. Had that been the case we should expect vastly better conditions in characteristic speeches like these. The comparatively good condition of his speeches at certain other points -- e.g. in Act II scene i -- is to be attributed to the presence on the stage of another actor who was concerned in the piracy.

After the line wrongly assigned to Nim there is a huge lacuna in the Quarto. The short speech which Nim actually does deliver in the full text is omitted ('These be good humours: your Honor wins bad humors'). The first half of the Boy's long speech is also omitted -- from "As young as I am" to "...that was against a Post, when he was drunke". The standard of the reporting of the rest of the speech is not high; there is much omitted even here. The phrases "and call it Purchase" and "which makes much against my Manhood, if I should take from another's Pocket, to put into mine; for it is plaine pocketting vp of Wrongs" are omitted: the following comparisons show other omissions:-

F: Nim and Bardolph are sworne Brothers in filching: and  
in Callice they stole a fier-shovell.

Q: Nim stole a fier shouell.

F: I knew by that peece of Seruice, the men would carry Coales.

Q: I knew by that, they meant to carry coales.

The concluding passage is also omitted: "their Villany goes against my weak stomacke, and therefore I must cast it vp".

The Q speech ends in commonplace fashion;

Well, if they will not leaue me,  
I meane to leaue them.

developed from the Folio "I must leave them". In addition, the Q has a bad error in sequence; the passage "They would haue me as familiar.....and their Handkerchers" precedes the passage beginning "They will steale any thing.....", whereas in the Folio the order is the reverse.

After this, the four characters leave the stage. It is quite evident that the Q text up to this point is in a pretty dreadful condition, so bad that no actor taking any of these parts can have had anything to do with the transmission of the text. We have seen that certain parts of Q II i are in a much better condition: the same four characters are present there, but Mrs Quickly is also there. And when we find that Mrs Quickly's own speeches are much better than those of the other characters present with her on the stage, we come naturally to the conclusion that an actor of her part was concerned in the production of the 'copy' for Q.

The Q version of Act III scene 2 contains only eight lines after the entry of Gower and Fluellen: the whole Gower-Fluellen-Macmorris-Jamy episode is omitted. The episode is self-contained it can be cut with no damage to the main stream of the drama. Macmorris and Jamy appear only at this one point. We have already had fairly clear indications that at certain points an

abridgement underlies the Quarto -- an abridgement made with a view to cutting down the number of actors required. It seems most probable that we have another case of the same thing here, and that the extreme brevity of Q III ii after the exit of Nim and his friends is due not to defective transmission but to deliberate abridgement in the play underlying the Quarto text.

Scenes 5 and 7 take place in the French camp. In scene 5 Q has only 23 lines as against F's 69; and of these 23 lines, only eight reproduce the corresponding Folio line with no greater difference than a single word. That is to say, of the Folio material only approximately 33% is represented at all in the Quarto: and of the material actually present in Q only approximately 35% reproduces F with the measure of accuracy we have chosen as a criterion. These percentages agree with those calculated for the scene at the French court in Act II (scene iv) before Exeter's entry: there the figures were respectively 37% and 38%. Conditions in Q III vii -- a prose scene -- are so bad as to make analysis almost impossible. For one thing, there is much confusion owing to alteration in order.

If we turn to the Quarto version of Act III scene 6 we find a completely different state of affairs. Q marches parallel with F all the time; the omissions are very small ones; and the standard of approximation to the Folio is very high indeed. The scene is a long and difficult one; yet the high standard of the reporting is maintained throughout. The following characters appear and speak: Gower, Fluellen, Pistol, King Henry, the

French Herald, and Gloucester. The only characters present all the time are the two first-named. As there is no perceptible change in the standard of the Quarto text with the exit or entry of any of the others, it is fair to assume that if the person responsible for the transmission of the text of this scene was an actor he must have taken the part of Fluellen or Gower. But Fluellen has already been eliminated: he figures in scene 2 of this Act, the text of which we have found to be deplorable in Q. I suggest as an explanation of the high level of scene 6 the hypothesis that an actor who took the part of Gower was concerned in the preparation of the 'copy' for the Quarto.

Speaking of Q Sir Edmund Chambers says that "the best rendered scenes are those in which Exeter, Gower, and the Governor of Harfleur appear. Conceivably the 'part' of one or more of these may have been available" (William Shakespeare, vol. 1, p.391). With the problem of the Governor we shall deal in a moment; but it seems hardly likely that the 'part' of either Exeter or Gower underlies the Quarto. Not only are there mistakes in speeches by both of these characters; but the high standard of the reporting goes beyond their own speeches -- it is found at points where they are on the stage even when others are speaking. I agree with Chambers when he says (loc. cit.) that "some unevenness of demerit suggests that the reporter may have been an actor"; but memorial reconstruction is a far more justifiable hypothesis. The comparative excellence of Act III scene vi extends to the whole scene, not merely to the part of



Gower<sup>1</sup>.

It has been stated already that scene 3 is peculiar in that while only 18 of the Folio's 58 lines are represented at all the condition of these 18 is practically perfect. The variations are trifling:

III iii:

<u>line</u>	Q	F
2	weele	we will
6	we	I
8	be	lie
9	are	shall be
13	succour	Succours
14	word	that
	not yet	yet not
15	dread	great
18	defensive now	defensible.

The variant in line 9 involves a slight metrical defect in the Quarto; and there is another, along with faulty line-division, in the passage from line 4 to line 6. These points tend to eliminate the possibility of a player's 'part' underlying the Quarto here.

Now the problem of whether an omission in Q is due to deliberate abridgement in the version of the play underlying the text or merely to defective memorial transmission is generally a mere balance of probabilities. We have found several scenes where a quantitative defect in the Quarto coincided with a

---

1. This may likewise be said against Price, who also thinks that Gower's written "part" was available during the compilation of the Quarto text. See The Text of Henry V, p.19.

qualitative one: in such cases we might say that the balance lay in favour of defective memorial transmission as an explanation of the omission. But where the quality of what is found in Q is extraordinarily high it may seem more probable that an omission of the magnitude of this in scene 3 is due to abridgement: this is especially so inasmuch as the dramatic continuity is not damaged.

The condition of the Q text of III iii is best explained by the theory that an actor who took the part of the Governor was implicated in the memorial reconstruction which underlies the Q 'copy', and that it was a stage abridgement which was reconstructed.

Now the condition of the Q text of Acts I and II has suggested that an actor who had played the part of Exeter was concerned in the transmission of that text; the condition of Act III has suggested that an actor who had taken the part of Gower was likewise implicated. Gower does not appear in the play until Act III. In the Folio Exeter appears in Act III, as a member of the King's retinue in III iii; he is directly addressed once ( F III iii 51), but has himself nothing to say during the entire Act. Furthermore the line in which he is addressed occurs in a passage which the Quarto omits. Thus as far as that text is concerned, Exeter's presence in Act 3 is wholly unnecessary. It would therefore be reasonable to suppose that the parts of Exeter and Gower were doubled in the performances which underlie the memorial reconstruction. But

there are serious objections to this view.

In the Folio Exeter and Gower appear together on the stage in two scenes in Act IV. In IV vii Exeter is among the lords who accompany King Henry, and he speaks only one line:

Here comes the Herald of the French, my Liege (F line 64). In the Quarto version of this scene Exeter does not appear at all, and his line is omitted: this would agree with the argument that 'Exeter' is at this moment on the stage as Gower. But in the case of IV viii things are not so easy. Gower enters at the beginning of the scene in the Quarto, in the company of Fluellen and "the Souldier": he does not say anything, but his presence is necessary, for he is twice directly addressed by Fluellen. At line 8 Henry enters with Exeter and other lords, and Exeter speaks a little later (Q lines 55 seq.). Two characters played by the same actor cannot appear simultaneously on the stage!

The same difficulty faces Signor Giordano-Orsini in his investigation of the text of Heywood's If You Know Not Me Part I.<sup>1</sup> He shows that the text is a memorial reconstruction (Heywood was mistaken in supposing it a stenographic report);<sup>2</sup>

1. See The Library, vol. XIV (1933-4), pp. 313 seq.

2. Orsini admits that stenography may have played some part in the transmission of the text: but not the main part.

See also W. W. Greg, The Library, Vol. XVII (1936-7), pp. 173-4.

and he claims that the reconstruction was the work of two actors, one of whom was the Clown: the other had played the parts of Gage, Dodds, and King Philip. But in scene 14 both Gage and Philip are on the stage at the same time. There is a stage-direction "Enter Phillip, Sussex, and Gage", and Gage is once addressed and himself speaks once: the part of Philip in this scene is a large one. Giordano-Orsini does not however regard this as an obstacle to his hypothesis. What Gage says, and what is said to him, might be said by, and to, any gentleman of the Court. Presumably he holds that in the stage version behind the memorial reconstruction the part of Gage was temporarily taken by some other character while the proper actor of that part was playing Philip, but that the reporting actors actually wrote down in their reconstruction the assignation and reference of the full version, the version prior to the stage-version in which they had played.

A similar explanation might avail in the case in Henry V which is before us. Exeter's speeches in IV viii might have been taken by another lord in the stage-adaptation behind Q Henry V, while the actor who played Exeter's part elsewhere (i.e. the reporting actor himself) was present here as Gower. The lines involved are Q IV viii 55-58 and 80 -- a very small part. Or, on the other hand, the reporting actor may have appeared in the acting version of IV viii as Exeter; and Gower, who has nothing to say, may not have appeared there at all. In that case we would have a situation like that suggested in our

discussion of Act II scene 2: there we saw distinct traces of two separate versions of the scene -- a shortened one with only one traitor (Masham) and the full version. It has been maintained that 'Exeter' acted in an abridgement, but that at certain points he had also some knowledge of the full version.

IV viii may be a case in point: the shortened version may have begun with the entry of the King (Q line 9) so that the presence of Gower is unnecessary and the actor who played him is free to play Exeter. But he may still have known that in the full version there was some preliminary matter involving Gower, and he may therefore have put it in.

So far it has been possible to explain away obstacles against the suggestion that the parts of Exeter and Gower were doubled in the performances underlying the Quarto text. But there is a greater obstacle. Exeter appears in Act IV scene vi; after his last speech there are only five short lines, two of which are a direct reply to him. But Gower comes on at the very beginning of the next scene and speaks at the fourth line. Again, Exeter appears in IV viii, and cannot leave the stage before the end of that scene; but Gower enters at the beginning of the next scene (V i) and speaks the first line. The same difficulty stands in the way of Giordano-Orsini's theory that in the performances underlying the Heywood Quarto the parts of Gage and Philip were both taken by the same actor. Philip speaks the last line of scene xiii and Gage enters at the beginning of scene xiv and speaks the fifth line. Orsini does



not even mention this difficulty; but surely some change of costume would be necessary so that the audience should be able to differentiate between the different characters played by the same actor. And in these cases which have been mentioned there is no time for such a change. It seems, then, that we must believe that two adult actors were implicated in the transmission of the Quarto text of Henry V, one of whom had played the part of Exeter, the other that of Gower.

The only appearance of the Governor of Harfleur in the entire play is in Act III scene iii. It is a very small part, consisting of only one speech of seven lines. This speech is remarkably well reproduced in the Quarto. The variations from the Folio version are these:- Q III iii 13 "succour" F do. line 45 "Succours"; Q line 14 "Returnes vs word, his powers..." F line 45 "Returnes vs, that his Powers...."; Q do. "not yet" F do. "yet not"; Q line 15 "dread" F line 47 "great"; Q line 18 "defensiuue now" F line 50 "defensible". Metre and line-division are perfect in the Quarto.

There is a very striking bibliographical link between the Quarto and Folio versions of the speech, viz. the punctuation. The Folio version contains three colons, (1) after "end", the last word in line 44, (2) after "Siege" in the middle of line 47, (3) after "Mercy" at the end of line 48. All three are reproduced in exactly the same positions in the Quarto version, which introduces no other colons in this speech. Of the seven commas in the F version of the speech five are reproduced in

that of the Quarto, at exactly the same points;<sup>1</sup> and one other is reproduced at the corresponding point though the text varies (Q line 14 "Returnes vs word, his" F line 46 "Returnes vs, that his"). Thus the only difference in punctuation between the two versions of the speech is that Q omits the comma after "Dolphin" (cf. Q line 13, F line 45). This virtually complete agreement in punctuation cannot be coincidence. The two versions must be derived ultimately from the same manuscript. The most reasonable hypothesis is that behind the Quarto version lies the written "part" of the actor who played the Governor, transcribed from the playhouse manuscript which must ultimately underlie the Folio text. The omission of the single comma, and the variants "succour/Succours" and "not yet/yet not" are insignificant; if the Folio accurately reproduces an authentic manuscript at these points the Quarto merely exhibits three trifling errors of transcription (and indeed the compositor may not be guiltless). The transcriber of the "part" probably wrote "defensiuē" instead of "defensible", looking carefully only at the beginning of the word and jumping to a wrong conclusion; then he, or some "editor", seeing the resultant metrical deficiency, "corrected" it by inserting the word "now". There remain two variants: and we may perhaps visualise as the transcriber of the "part" someone

---

1. F line 45 Q line 13 "entreated,": F line 46 Q line 14 "ready": F line 47 Q line 15 "King,": F line 49 "Gates," Q line 17 "gates," F do. Q do. "ours,".

who knew the play, who was consequently a little hasty in the reading of his "copy", and who was influenced at these two points by reminiscences of other passages in the play. Thus he may have written "Returnes vs word, his powers are not yet ready" through anticipation of F III v 69, where the King of France says "And quickly bring vs word of Englands fall"; and very possibly he substituted "dread King" for "great King" as the result of a recollection of F I ii 99 "dread Soueraigne" and/or I ii 105 "my dread Lord". At any rate, the evidence of the punctuation seems to me quite conclusive; the "part" must underlie the Quarto version of the Governor's speech. If the Folio gives this speech correctly (which there is no reason to doubt), and if there has been no revision in the playhouse manuscript between stages represented by Q and F (which there is no reason to suppose), the variants in the Q version must be attributed to carelessness in transcription.

As for the rest of the scene, the King's first speech, which in the Folio runs to 43 lines, consists of only eleven lines in the Quarto, representing the first ten and the last two of the Folio version.<sup>1</sup> But the material which is represented in the Quarto is reproduced wonderfully accurately as far as the words go. There are only four variations, viz.

---

1. The discrepancy in the totals is due to the mislineation in lines 4-6 of the Quarto version of the speech.

Q III iii 2 "weele" F do. line 2 "we will", Q line 6 "we"  
 F line 7 "I", Q line 8 "be" F line 9 "lye", Q line 9 "are"  
 F line 10 "shall be". Owing to this last variation Q line 9  
 is unmetrical; and there is mislineation in Q lines 4-6, which  
 renders it unlikely that any authentic manuscript or transcript  
 underlies the Q text of the speech. Yet the accuracy is re-  
 markable: and in view of the distinct possibility that the  
 speech has been drastically abridged in the stage-version under-  
 lying the Quarto we must concentrate on the qualitative excel-  
 lence of the lines in that text and not on its quantitative de-  
 ficiency.

The high quality of the reporting in Q III iii goes beyond  
 the Governor's part, then: and I would suggest that the actor  
 who took that part was himself implicated in the memorial re-  
 construction. He had a transcript of his own speech, and in  
 addition was able to give a good account from memory of the  
 remainder of a drastically abridged version of the scene.

It is of course quite inconceivable that the small part of  
 the Governor would be played by an actor who did not also play  
 another part or other parts. Gower appears in III ii and III  
 vi; Exeter has no speaking part in Act III. It would there-  
 fore seem more convenient that 'Exeter' should take the part of  
 the Governor. But, though Exeter has no speaking part in Act  
 III, he is present in the Folio version of III iii as a member  
 of King Henry's retinue, and the King directly addresses him in  
 the speech beginning

Open your Gates: Come Vnckle Exeter,  
Goe you and enter Harflew;....

This speech is wanting in the Quarto; and one is tempted to see an abridger at work on the stage-adaptation underlying the Quarto. Seeing that this speech was addressed to Exeter, and realising (according to the hypothesis conjectured) that the actor of that part was playing the role of the Governor in this scene, he may well have simply excised the whole speech, admittedly leaving the scene with a distinctly abrupt ending.

As for the hypothesis, deduced in this chapter from the evidence of Act III, that an actor who had played the part of Gower was concerned in the memorial reconstruction, I can see no objection to it in any other scene in which Gower is involved. The standard of the reporting of his speeches is consistently high; and the omission of his long speech in V i (F lines 67-76; "Go, go, you are a counterfeit cowardly Knaue.....teach you a good English condition, fare ye well") may be due to cutting.



DID THE ACTOR OF MRS QUICKLY'S  
PART TAKE ANY OTHER ROLE?

We must now turn our attention to a scene in the Quarto which contains dialogue in French, viz. III iv. At first sight the French in this text seems to be an incoherent jumble, but closer examination shows that this impression is incorrect. The spelling is obviously intended for the most part to be phonetic, though some simple words are given their correct French spelling. Admittedly the phonetic spelling is sometimes ambiguous, and sometimes there are definite mistakes (e.g. the omission of necessary sounds). But it must be remembered that such 'copy' would doubtless give the compositor a good deal of trouble, and that he may not always have reproduced accurately the spelling which it contained.

The nature of the phonetic spelling may conveniently be illustrated by considering two points. Firstly: one of its most striking features is that where a word ending with a consonant is followed by a word beginning with a vowel, the liaison is in every case clearly indicated. Take the following instances in III iv.

In line 1 we have "venecia". A soft 'c' is omitted in the last syllable, for which the printer may conceivably be to blame. At any rate "venez ici" is obviously intended, the liaison being indicated by the letter 'c', pronounced as in "face". In the same line Q has "vous aues cates en" (i.e. "vous avez été en").

There are two legitimate liaisons here, both distinctly indicated. The second is represented twice over ( -s c-, the 'c' again soft). A third liaison is introduced gratuitously. The Quarto is consistent in its differentiation between the spelling "vous" and "vou" or "vow". The former is used only where the final 's' is sounded in liaison: see line 20 "vous aues ettue" (again two liaisons are indicated) and line 2 "vou parte", line 3 "vou" followed by "la" (also line 9), line 19 "vow parla", line 22 "vou" followed by "le". Other liaisons are represented in line 28 "et ill" (i.e. "est-il") and line 31 "Aloues a diner" (i.e. "allons à dîner").

Secondly: the letter "a" is used to denote three distinct sounds. Firstly, the short sound as in English "man" (e.g. Allice, aues, la, madam, sappela, ma, cella, par, parle, etc., etc.); secondly, a very short indeterminate sound, as for example the first and last "a's" in the word "englatara" (i.e. "Angleterre"); thirdly, the sound in the English word "face". Examples of this last are found in the following words: "(aues c)ate(s)", i.e. été (line 1); "englatara", i.e. Angleterre (line 2, also 20); "(s)ae palla", i.e. appelez (line 3, also 9 and 22); "a", i.e. et (line 9); "rehersera", i.e. reherserai (line 14); "ca", i.e. c'est (line 18); "parla", i.e. parlez (line 19). Note that the letter 'e' can also be used to indicate this sound: e.g. "parle", i.e. parler (line 24); "Ie oblye", i.e. j'ai oublié (line 12), etc. "Ie" can also indicate the simple pronoun "je", as for example in line 24 "Ie ne vew point parle", i.e. "je ne veux point parler".

Sufficient has been said to show the nature of the spelling. Next we should notice that there are several grammatical mistakes in the Quarto version of III iv. One of these is repeated three times, and cannot therefore be regarded as a mere slip or attributed to the compositor: in line 3 we have "Coman sae palla vou la main.....", in line 9 "E Coman sa pella vow la menton.....", and in line 22 "Coman se pella vou le peid.....". In each case we are to understand "comment s'appelez-vous...?" Presumably the person responsible for this enormity has confused the two separate constructions "comment s'appelle la main...." and "comment appelez-vous la main....". Another extraordinary blunder occurs in line 14, where the text reads "...Ie rehersera, tow t cella que Iac apoandre,...". Presumably the writer intended the 'a' and the 'c' of 'Iac' to have the pronunciation which they are given in, for example, the English word 'face'; and through a slip on his or the compositor's part an 'r' has been omitted in the word "apoandre". It would appear then that whoever was responsible for the French in the Quarto intended us to read "tout cela que j'ai s'apprendre"! There is, of course, a double blunder -- (1) the use of the infinitive form for that of the past participle, and (2) the misuse of the 3rd person reflexive pronoun, which has no right to be there. This latter seems to be a favourite solecism of the writer of the quarto French. There are two Anglicisms -- "remembre" in line 12, and "rehersera" in line 14. There are several wrong genders: "le main" and "la bras" in line 7, "la menton" and "la coll" in

line 9, "le robe" in line 22. In line 20 we have "ettue" for "été"; in line 21 we find "parle" for "parlerai". Another error occurs at the beginning of line 20: "...vow parla au se bon Angloys / Asie vous aues ettue en Englatara"; no sort of sense can be made out of "Asie", which would seem to represent "à si", and clearly "Comme si" is required: after "si" the form "avies" is necessary (Q "aves"). Lines 24-5 present a difficulty: "Ie ne vew poinct parle, / Sie plus devant....". I cannot quite see what the writer intends here, unless a syllable has been accidentally omitted before "Sie" in which case we might assume that he meant "ainsi" (i.e. "I certainly do not want to speak in this way any more in front of the chevaliers of France"); but why "plus"? Has she spoken English to the French chevaliers before? In line 28 the word "aussi" (spelt "ausie") is used, where the sense demands "ainsi".

One or two errors may confidently be attributed to the compositor. In line 2 we find "parte" for "parle" (i.e. "parlez"). The last word of line 2 ("englatara") should come at the end of line 1: probably the end of line 1 was turned over into the line below in the 'copy' but not marked off with a bracket, so that the compositor understood it as the end of line 2. In line 13 we have "tude" for "cude" (i.e. "coude"). "Peid" (for "pied") in line 22 may also be a simple misprint. In line 25 we find "che cheualires"; we may imagine the writer of the 'copy' beginning the word, pausing for a moment to consider the spelling, and then writing the whole word: presumably the

compositor followed his 'copy'. In line 31 the Quarto has "Aloues" for "Alones" (i.e. "Allons"), a simple misprint.

Finally attention may be called to three other slips: in line 3 "francoy" should be "Anglois"; and at two points (lines 5 and 11) the "da" or "de", representing "the" in broken English, is introduced into the French portion of the dialogue.

I now proceed to transcribe the Quarto version of III iv in modern French spelling, so that its coherence can be easily appreciated. The trifling printing errors noticed above will be corrected without notice; the grammatical errors with which I have dealt will also be corrected, the substitutions being placed within brackets.

Enter Katherine, Alice.

Kate. Alice, venez ici; vous avez été en Angleterre; vous parlez fort bon Anglais. Comment appelez-vous la main en Anglais?

Alice. La main, madame? De han.

Kate. Et le bras?

Alice. De arma, madame.

Kate. La main -- da han; le bras -- de arma.

Alice. Oui, madame.

Kate. Et comment appelez-vous le menton et le col?

Alice. De neck et de cin, madame.

Kate. Et de neck, et de cin. Et le coude?

Alice. Le coude? ma foi, j'ai oublié -- mais je (m'en souviens): le coude -- O! de elbo, madame.

Kate. Ecoutez; je (répéterai) tout cela que j'ai (appris): de han, de arma, de neck, de cin, et de bilbo.

Alice. De elbo, madame.

Kate. O Jesu, j'ai oublié; ma foi -- écoutez, je raconterai:-- de han, de arma, de neck, de cin, et de elbo. Et c'est bon.

Alice. Ma foi, madame, vous parlez aussi bon Anglais (comme) si vous (aviez) été en Angleterre.

Kate. Par la grace de Dieu, en petit temps je (parlerai) meilleur. Comment appelez-vous le pied et la robe?

Alice. Le foot et le con (i.e. 'gown').

Kate. Le fot et le con: O Jesu! Je ne veux point parler (ainsi)...devant les chevaliers de France pour un million. Ma foi!



Alice. Madame, de foote et le con.

Kate. O, est-il (ainsi)? Ecoutez, Alice: de han, de arma, de neck, de cin, le foote, et de con.

Alice. C'est fort bon, madame.

Kate. Allons á dîner.

Exit omnes.

One cannot claim that this is good French; it abounds in turns of expression which are eminently un-French. It is the sort of French that we expect an Englishman with a limited knowledge of the language to produce. But the point to be stressed is that, unidiomatic and full of faults as it is, it is yet perfectly coherent and comprehensible. Even the serious grammatical errors which we noted above fail to interfere with the general intelligibility of the quarto text: the sequence is natural, and we immediately realise what the speakers mean. That is the important point.

Hardin Craig holds that the French of the quarto represents that of a version of the play distinct from and anterior to that given in the folio. Comparing the folio and quarto texts he says "The French portions of the play show....indications of revision, both in minor amplifications and in apparently deliberate changes of meaning". Take the following two pairs of corresponding passages in F and Q: (1) F III iv 35-6 "vous pronunciez les mots ausi droict, que les Natifs d'Angleterre" (i.e. "vous prononcez les mots aussi droit que les natifs d'Angleterre"), Q III iv 19-20 "vow parla au se bon Angloys / Asie vous aues ettue en Englatara" (i.e., with the corrections already indicated, "vous parlez aussi bon Anglais (comme) si vous av(i)ez été en Angleterre"): (2) F lines 50-1 "Ie ne

voudray prononcer" (i.e. "je ne voudrais prononcer"), Q line 24 "Je ne vew point parle" (i.e. "je ne veux point parler"). At both of these points the Quarto conveys a similar meaning to that of the Folio but employs French forms and constructions other than those used in the Folio text. Hardin Craig may be right in regarding the folio version as a revision and amplification of the text-basis of the quarto; on the other hand it seems just as probable that the quarto version of this scene represents an abridged and slightly modified version of the full text as found in the folio -- an abridged version made by someone who knew some French but was capable of howlers. At any rate it seems probable that the quarto here represents a version of the scene distinct from that of the folio.

But we have still to account for the general coherence and intelligibility of the Quarto version of III iv. It might be argued that one of the actor-reporters knew some French, or that they received assistance from someone else who did; the person concerned had some knowledge of the full version of the scene as found in the Folio, and founded his own version on that, using in places French words and constructions other than those of his original. Some such theory would meet the case.

But it would be a mistake to consider the problem of the French in the Quarto in isolation. We should relate the condition of Q III iv to the hypothesis which we have evolved from our examination of other parts of the text of the edition. The hypothesis is that of memorial reconstruction by pirate-actors.

So far we have found especially good the parts of Exeter, Gower, the Governor of Harfleur, and Mrs Quickly. The first three of these are adult parts, none of which could of course have been doubled by the actor of Mrs Quickly's part. Now Mrs Quickly does not appear in either Folio or Quarto text after Act II scene iii. And it has been suggested that behind the Quarto lies a stage-abridgement in which the number of actors required had been reduced. It is virtually certain that the actor who played Mrs Quickly, released from that part at the end of II iii, would play another female part in the last three Acts. If so, he must have played either Katherine or Alice. In that case we can relate the general coherence of Q III iv to the presence on the stage during the whole of that scene of one of the reporting actors. I would suggest this hypothesis as worthy of consideration: the actor of Mrs Quickly's part also played either Katherine or Alice; the version of III iv in performances of which he had played was not that which stands in the Folio text -- it may have been an earlier version, but was more probably an abridged and slightly modified version of the full (F) text containing several grammatical errors; the reporting actor with whom we are concerned had a fairly accurate recollection of the words spoken on the stage in the version underlying Q, and he reproduced them on the whole coherently; it is safe to assume that he did not have much knowledge of French orthography -- probably he did not even know the language -- but, remembering the sounds he had heard, he indicated them for the most part in

phonetic spelling.

If one of the reconstructing actors took the part of Katherine or Alice we should expect the Quarto text of the other scene in which the two French ladies appear (V ii) to be of good quality. But the Quarto version of that scene is execrable; it is certainly among the worst reported passages in the whole text. Yet the reader is being invited to believe that one of the actors responsible for the memorial reconstruction is present on the stage. At first sight the very poor quality of the reporting of this scene seems to demolish that suggestion.

But Q V ii is characterised by a bibliographical peculiarity of which we must certainly take account. The portion of the scene which is occupied with King Henry's wooing of Katherine (Q lines 23-114) -- that is, the portion in which the two Frenchwomen are directly involved in the dialogue -- contains an extraordinary number of exceedingly short lines. The succession of these is interrupted from time to time by one or more longer lines, but these are decidedly in the minority.

This peculiarity is confined to V ii; here and there we find one or two very short lines in other prose passages in the Quarto, but never in such quantities as these. It seems to me that conditions in Q V ii from line 23 on require a better explanation than the mere assumption of erratic methods on the part of a reporter.

I should like tentatively to advance a hypothesis which

involves the following propositions: (1) in this portion of the play the 'copy' for the Quarto existed in two distinct stages; (2) as originally written, the 'copy' contained a text different from that found in the Quarto itself; (3) before the 'copy' was sent to the printer the original ending was cancelled -- simply stroked out; (4) the person responsible for this inserted another version of the end of the play, writing it on the very pages which contained the cancelled matter. If the greater part of the pages concerned was already filled with lines of writing through which a pen had been drawn, much of the added material would have to be written in the margins; if this was done horizontally (or very slightly diagonally) it would be necessary to make the lines very short. But there would be places on such a page as we are visualising where it would be possible to write longer lines. There would be space at the top and bottom of such a page; again, the writer of the original stratum might have turned the last word or two of a line down into the end of the next line-space, beginning the following line of his text in the next line-space after that, so that there would be room at the beginning of the second of these line-spaces for the interpolator to continue a line of his marginal insertion some way across the page; there may have been a considerable space between some of the lines of the original version, again giving the interpolator an opportunity to continue a line or two of his insertion across the page. This hypothesis does account for the curious lineation of Q V ii 23 ff. -- it accounts both for the



frequency of the very short lines and for the occurrence from time to time of a longer line or lines.

The material which actually stands in the Quarto at this point is obviously a very scanty and imperfect report of the corresponding text found in the Folio, or an imperfect report of an abridgement of that. The conjecture may be hazarded that the hypothetical original stratum represented the text of a version of the end of the play anterior to that of the Folio. Thus a Shakespearian revision of at least the end of the play is suggested. But the implication of the theory which concerns us most here is that the Quarto text of V ii 23 ff. was not the work of the actor who played the roles of Mrs Quickly and either Katherine or Alice, but of an interpolator who cancelled the original reporters' version and substituted another. Thus the very poor condition of this part of the Quarto text need not deter us from the belief that an actor who had played the part of either Katherine or Alice was concerned in the memorial reconstruction which underlies the Quarto text.

CHAPTER 5.

MISCELLANEOUS.

A NOTE ON SOME STAGE-DIRECTIONS.

At certain points we have discovered evidence that a stage-abridgement underlies the Quarto text, an abridgement in which the number of actors required for performance had been reduced. But at some of these same points we find references in stage-directions to characters which had in all probability been cut out in the abridgement.

One of the main reasons for cutting out the first scene of Act I was doubtless that the character of the Bishop of Ely was thus dispensed with: his single speech in scene ii is assigned to another character (see Chapter 1). Yet the stage-direction at the beginning of I ii reads in Q "Enter King Henry, Exeter, 2 Bishops, Clarence, and other Attendants". There is only one Bishop in the text: in other words, while the text apparently represents an abridgement the initial stage-direction is that of a fuller version.

An interesting problem is raised in Act IV scene i. The sequence of episodes in the Folio version of this scene is as follows: (i) a conversation between the King, Gloucester, and Erpingham (lines 1-35); at line 35 all leave except the King: (ii) the episode between the King and Pistol, who enters at line 35; this episode occupies the passage from line 36 to line 63, at which point Pistol goes out, the King remains, and Fluellen and Gower enter: (iii) the dialogue between Fluellen and Gower, the King observing; the two former go out at line

82, and the King remains: (iv) the episode of the King and the three Soldiers (lines 85-222): at line 222 the soldiers go out, leaving the King on: (v) a soliloquy by the King (lines 223-283): (vi) at line 283 Erpingham comes in, and there is a five-line conversation between him and the King: Erpingham goes out at line 288: (vii) another short soliloquy by the King (lines 289-306): (viii) at line 306 Gloucester enters, and the scene concludes with a four-line conversation between him and the King: the two go out at line 310.

At the end of No. (iv) the Folio stage-direction is 'Exit Souldiers'; the King remains and delivers his long soliloquy. At the corresponding point in Q we also have 'Exit the souldiers'; there is no mention of the King. But not a line of the ensuing soliloquy is found in the Quarto: and immediately after the direction 'Exit the souldiers' we have another direction "Enter the King, Gloster, Epingham (sic), and Attendants". If the absence of the sixty-line soliloquy is due to cutting, as seems the most obvious explanation, we have another case where the text is that of an abridgement but the stage-direction that of a fuller version: for the stage-direction 'Exit the souldiers' (Q line 114) leaves the king on to deliver a soliloquy which is actually cut. And what is to all intents a new scene in Q is immediately begun with a direction for the re-entry of the King, who is already on.

Now the Q stage-direction "Enter the King, Gloster, Epingham, and Attendants" (also line 114) presents a further point of

interest. Episodes (i) and (vi) in the above analysis of the Folio sequence are completely omitted in the Quarto: that is to say, the character of Erpingham is cut out in the stage-abridgement underlying that text. So although the five-line dialogue between the King and Erpingham is cut out in the stage-abridgement behind Q (i.e. F lines 284-8) Erpingham's entry is provided for in the stage-direction. Again the text seems to represent an abridgement and the stage-direction a fuller version.

We can go a step further. This Q stage-direction actually stands above a soliloquy by the King (see F); at the corresponding point in F we have only 'Enter Erpingham', just above the five-line conversation between him and the King. In the Folio Gloucester does not enter until the King's speech is finished, i.e. at line 306. In Q at that same point we have the appropriate direction 'Enter Gloster'. That is to say, Gloucester does not enter at the stage-direction at Q line 114: his entry is specifically provided for at the proper place. It is probable that not only is the Q stage-direction at line 114 that of a fuller version of the play than the Q text represents, but that during the preparation of the Q 'copy' access was had to the 'plot' of that fuller version. Thus, regarding Q line 115 (corresponding to F line 289) as the beginning of a new scene, the names of all the characters who entered at any point in it would be written out together in the 'plot'.

In the Folio there are three plays the 'copy' for which may



306

not impossibly have been 'assembled' from the players' 'parts', with the assistance of the 'plot'. These are The Merry Wives, The Two Gentlemen, and The Winter's Tale. In The Merry Wives the names of the characters appearing in each scene are listed collectively at the head of that scene; their entrances are not distributed at the proper points in the scene (see Crompton Rhodes, Shakespeare's First Folio, p. 97). The same phenomenon appears in The Two Gentlemen. The Winter's Tale has an additional peculiarity. Chambers says (William Shakespeare, Vol. I, pp. 488-9): "The entries are normally given in IV iii and V ii, but for the other scenes all the characters taking part, whether they are present from the beginning or not, are grouped in an initial entry. This follows the order of their appearance, and in II i, III ii, V i, and V iii, but not elsewhere, the successively appearing characters or groups of characters are marked off by colons in the stage-directions. These stage-directions might come from a plot. The case differs from that of Two Gentlemen of Verona in that some of the entries are given again in I ii, II iii, III iii, and IV iv at their proper places in the text....". This is the same peculiarity as we have seen in the stage-direction in Q Henry V IV i ll4: Gloucester's entry, noted here, is repeated at the proper place below (Q line 129); and the stage-direction, that of a fuller version than that of Q, gives the characters in the order of their successive appearance in F -- Gloucester after Erpingham.

Chambers himself says that conceivably a plot was available

during the construction of the Q text: his reason is that "a few marginal notes for action are common to Q and F", viz. II i Q 75 "They draw" F 91 "Draw", IV viii Q 6 "He strikes him" F 8 "Strikes him", and V i Q 25 "He strikes him" F 29 "Strikes him".

There is evidence suggesting the use of the 'plot' of a version fuller than the abridgement underlying the Quarto only at the few points mentioned: it may only have been fragmentary.

The two important points are these:

1. While at some points the Q stage-directions are those of an abridgement (e.g. at the head of II ii: Q "Enter Exeter and Gloster" F "Enter Exeter, Bedford, & Westmerland" -- see Chap. 2) at others they are those of a fuller version than that represented by the text.
2. There is some evidence at one or two points that during the construction of the Q text the 'plot' (possibly in a fragmentary condition) of a fuller version than the abridgement behind Q may possibly have been available.

We may conclude this section by referring briefly to other differences in character-names between Q and F:

III vii and IV v: F Dauphin Q Bourbon:

F is inconsistent with itself (and with historical fact) in having the Dauphin present at Agincourt. At III v 65 the King of France says that his son is to remain in Rouen: this passage is reproduced in Q, which is therefore consistent in having the Dauphin absent in these scenes. The F inconsistency would however mean nothing to Shakespeare. There is no reason

to suppose that he corrected it: Professor C. H. Herford (Eversley ed., p. 6) says of this and other changes that "it is difficult to resist the inference that Shakespeare did perform some slight redistribution" of small parts. Chambers is probably nearer the mark in saying (Vol. I, p.392) "I can only suppose that the reporter has failed to disentangle the French lords". A possible explanation of the form Bourbon is provided by Act V scene ii. At the beginning the French people listed in the stage-direction are the King, Katherine (erronesouly called the Queen)<sup>I</sup> and Burbon. King Henry greets these three successively, and we find that in the text 'Burbon' is Burgundy. For Burgundy the Folio has, both in the initial stage-direction and in line 7, the form 'Burgogne': this might in careless English speech become 'Burgon' (accent on first syllable), and it might be misheard as 'Burbon'. In this way a reporting actor might have got hold of the name 'Burbon': having at the end of III v produced the line 'Sonne Dolphin you shall stay in Rone with me' the reporting actor may have reasoned that the

- 
1. Part of the S.D. at the head of Q V ii reads "...And at the other doore, the King of France, Queene Katherine, the Duke of Burbon, and others." I suggest very tentatively that perhaps a punctuation-mark has dropped out in the printing: the original direction may have read "...Queene, Katherine...". If so, we have another case of a S.D. belonging to a fuller version than the abridgement behind Q. In Q V ii the Queen of France's part is omitted: this may well have been due to abridgement (in F the character appears only in this scene). On the other hand Q's "Queene Katherine" may be merely a confusion made in the process of memorial reporting.

Dolphin could not have been present in III vii and IV v and put in Bourbon instead. It must be remembered that the two reporting actors we have visualised took the parts of Exeter-Gower-Governor and Mrs Quickly respectively: neither would be present in these two scenes with the French forces at Agincourt; the poor quality of the reporting at these points shows how little either knew about them.

III vii and IV v: F Rambure Q Gebon:

The scenes in which the French nobles are involved are the worst reported in the Quarto; neither of our two pirate-actors was present; Rambure has a very small part, and the name is in any case a difficult one. The reporters might easily have forgotten the name (if they ever knew it) and substituted the name of an actor who had played the part. Chambers (Vol. I, p.392) suggests that Gebon is "possibly an actor's name. Price suggests a corruption of that of Samuel Gilburne, or less plausibly a Thomas Gibborne, only known as a Fortune 'housekeeper' in 1624".

A NOTE ON THE CHORUSES.

The Prologue, the four Choruses preliminary to Acts II - V, and the Epilogue are not present in the Quarto. In the Chorus to Act V there is a reference to the Earl of Essex:

Were now the Generall of our gracious Empresse,  
As in good time he may, from Ireland comming,  
Bringing Rebellion broached on his sword;  
How many would the peacefull Citie quit,  
To welcome him? much more, and much more cause,  
Did they this Harry.

Essex left for Ireland in March 1599 and returned to London on September 28th of the same year: so we have a terminus a quo and ad quem for the composition of this passage. Furthermore, the period March-September 1599 is generally regarded as a suitable date for the entire play as found in the Folio. There is no indication at any point that a version earlier than that of the Folio underlies the Quarto: and that edition was published in 1600. In all probability, therefore, the Choruses were in existence when the 'copy' for Q was prepared. Their omission may be due to any of three causes:

1. Defective transmission: the reporting actors were unable to remember them.
2. Cutting in the stage-abridgement underlying the Quarto text, for the sake of brevity.
3. "It is possible that the performances reported took place after the unsuccessful return of Essex made the reference



to him in the chorus before Act V unsuitable" (Chambers, Vol. I, p.393).

In their 1919 article Professors Pollard and Wilson referred to Lionel Jacob's note on the chorus to Act II: this chorus concludes thus:

The King is set from London, and the Scene  
Is now transported (Gentles) to Southampton,  
There is the play-house now, there must you sit,  
And thence to France shall we conuey you safe,  
And bring you backe: Charming the narrow seas  
To giue you gentle Passe: for if we may,  
Wee'll not offend one stomacke with our Play.  
But till the King come forth, and not till then,  
Vnto Southampton do we shift our Scene.

Clearly the last two lines are an afterthought. Without them the chorus is appropriate to a version of the play in which what is now Act II scene ii followed immediately. The last two lines have been tacked on to accord with a version in which the chorus is followed immediately by Act II scene i.

Professors Pollard and Wilson argued that Q II i was the work of the interpolating pirate-actor. In the full version from which their 1593 abridgement was made the Chorus (without the last two lines) was followed by what is now II ii. The chorus itself was cut in the abridgement, and the pirate-actor did not know it well enough to insert it.

But the 1593 transcript theory is not satisfactory. We have seen that even if there are two strata of text in Q both are the result of memorial reconstruction. There is no proof that any part of the Q text represents a version of the play earlier than the Folio: the abridgement behind certain parts of

Q is probably an abridgement of a version substantially that of the Folio. As Chambers says "If Q is read side by side with F, it is impossible to regard it as anything but a continual perversion of the same text....practically everything is related to F" (Vol. I, p. 391). There is no reason to suppose that when the Q text was made up the entire F text was not in existence.

All we can say, therefore, is that the F chorus before Act II shows us two stages in the history of the play:

- A. The chorus, without the last two lines, followed by what is now Act II scene ii.
- B. The chorus, with the last two lines, followed by Act II scene i.

It is quite possible that what underlies Q is an abridgement of stage B, in which the chorus has been cut.

Chambers suggests an alternative explanation of the two makeshift lines.

The last two lines of the chorus to Act ii must be an afterthought, intended to correct the suggestion of lines 34-5 that the locality at once shifted to Southampton. This may be due to the Folio editor, who may have had the choruses on loose scrolls, and should have inserted this one and begun Act ii a scene later. In fact his supplementary lines probably replaced an act heading already set up, and he then put in Acts ii and iii where Acts iii and iv should be, and an Act iv, for which he had no chorus left, at random.

(William Shakespeare, Vol. I, p.393.)

This, plausible as it is, fails to account for II iii, another London scene. Even if the chorus (without the last two lines) properly stood immediately above II ii (the Southampton scene) it indicates that after that Southampton scene there should come

a scene in France (i.e. II iv). The second London scene -- II iii -- interrupts this sequence. It is more probable therefore that stage A above did not have Act II scene iii, that the careless adaptation of the prologue for stage B was incomplete (not providing for II iii), and that the stage underlying Q is stage B, abridged by the excision of the chorus.

CONCLUSIONS.

1. The Quarto text of Henry V is a memorial reconstruction.
  2. The reconstruction was effected by three actors, who had played the following roles: (1) Exeter and the Governor of Harfleur, (2) Gower, (3) Mrs Quickly and Katherine or Alice.
  3. There is no evidence that behind any portion of the Quarto text there lies a version of the play earlier than that given in the Folio.
  4. There is evidence at certain points that a stage-abridgement underlies the Quarto.
  5. There is evidence that the reconstructing actor 'Exeter' knew both this abridgement and a fuller version. He had less knowledge of passages in the latter not included in the former.
  6. At certain points the text is that of an abridgement while the stage-directions are those appropriate to the full version.
  7. The reconstructors had in their possession the 'part' of the Governor, or a transcript of it.
  8. They may have also possessed the following documents:  
(1) a transcript of V ii 337-42 (in the Folio numbering),  
and (2) a fragmentary 'plot' appropriate not to the stage-abridgement but to a fuller version.
  9. There may be an interpolation here and there, made subsequently to the main memorial reconstruction. But if at any point there are two strata in the Quarto text, both are the result of memorial transmission.
-

BIBLIOGRAPHY.HENRY V.

Chambers, E. K. William Shakespeare, 1930, Vol. I, pp. 388-96.

Clark, W. G. and Wright, W. Aldis. Works of Shakespeare (Cambridge edition), Vol. IV (1864), Introduction, pp. xii-xiii.

Craig, Hardin "The Relation of the First Quarto Version to the First Folio Version of Shakespeare's Henry V": Philological Quarterly, Vol. VI (1927), pp. 225-34.

Daniel, P. A. See Nicholson, Brinsley.

Evans, H. A. King Henry V, Arden edition, 1903, Introduction.

Greg, W. W. "Principles of Emendation in Shakespeare" (British Academy Shakespeare Lecture, 1928), re-printed in Aspects of Shakespeare, 1933 -- see pp. 142-4, 167-75.

Nicholson, Brinsley The Chronicle History of Henry the Fifth (Re-print of the First Quarto), New Shakspeare Society, 1875, with Introduction.

King Henry V: Parallel Texts of the First Quarto and First Folio Editions (New Shakspeare Society, 1877); with Introduction by P. A. Daniel.

"The Relation of the Quarto to the Folio Version of Henry V": Transactions of the New Shakspeare Society, 1880-2, pp. 77-102.

Pollard, A. W. and Wilson, J. Dover "The 'Stolne and Sur-reptitious' Shakespearian Texts: Henry V": Times Literary Supplement, March 13, 1919.

Price, Hereward T. The Text of 'Henry V' (undated; preface dated December 1920).

Robertson, J. M. "The Origination of 'Henry V'", The Shakespeare Canon, Vol. I (1922), pp. 1-65.

Symons, Arthur Introduction to the Praetorius facsimile of the First Quarto of Henry V (1886).



THE FIRST QUARTO OF 'ROMEO AND JULIET'.

INTRODUCTION.

1. See Purvis, *Shakespeare's Quartos*, p. 114.

2. Cf. F. T. A. *Shakespeare's Quartos*, p. 114. Dr. Purvis says: "The text 'Shakespeare' is an authority for the text of the first quarto, which contains the earliest and most complete text of the play."

## I.

DOES Q1 REPRESENT A 'FIRST SKETCH'?

The title-page of the second quarto bears the words "Newly corrected, augmented, and amended:". This was one of the reasons adduced by Charles Knight for postulating an extensive Shakespearian revision between the versions underlying the first and second quartos. "That the copy, both of the first edition and of the second, was derived from him (i.e. Shakespeare) is," he says, "to our minds, perfectly certain. We know of nothing in literary history more curious, or more instructive, than the example of minute attention, as well as consummate skill, exhibited by Shakespeare in correcting, augmenting and amending the first copy of this play."<sup>1</sup> But it is quite certain that the first quarto is one of the "stolne and surreptitious copies" referred to in the address "To the great Variety of Readers" prefixed to the first folio. That memory enters at some stage in its transmission is quite clear;<sup>2</sup> to say nothing of metrical and structural faults, omissions which render the text incomprehensible without reference to Q2, and so on, there are numerous transferences of words and phrases from one point in the play to another, anticipations and recollections.

---

1. See Furness, Variorum ed. Romeo & Juliet, p. 416.

2. Cf. W. W. Greg, Alcazar and Orlando, p. 256. Dr Greg uses the term "reporting" "as denoting any process of transmission which involves the memory no matter at what stage or in what manner".

The 1599 quarto was doubtless calculated to supersede the spurious edition of two years before: its publication put the authentic text into the hands of the public and the players had ensured that the copyright was now in the possession of Cuthbert Burby, "the first of their confidential publishers".<sup>1</sup> The phrase "Newly corrected, augmented, and amended," intended to procure a good sale for the volume, need mean no more for us than that this is the genuine text, replacing the previously published piracy. In the case of Q2 Hamlet this is even clearer: the title-page of that edition contains the advertisement "Newly imprinted and enlarged to almost as much againe as it was, according to the true and perfect Coppie". This contrasts the edition with the previous attenuated and spurious one of 1603. The words "Newly corrected and augmented" on the title-page of the 1598 quarto of Love's Labour's Lost, published by Burby, are sufficient to allow Dr Pollard to conjecture that a pirated edition, now lost, had previously appeared.<sup>2</sup> The title-page of Q2 Romeo and Juliet does not, then, necessarily imply a Shakespearian revision of that play subsequent to the version underlying Q1. A theory of such a revision must be founded upon other evidence.

R. G. White<sup>3</sup> maintained that "the text of Q1 is, in a great

---

1. Pollard, Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates, p. 48-9.

2.                               ibid.           p. 47.

3. See Furness, Variorum ed. Romeo & Juliet, pp. 417-22.

measure at least, but a corrupted version of that of Q2", but that nevertheless a certain amount of revision took place between the two versions. There are several passages in Q1 which he regarded -- in my view rightly -- as un-Shakespearian. These passages differ so widely from the corresponding passages in the authentic text that they cannot be explained simply as perversions of the latter. So White erected this theory: "that the Romeo and Juliet which has come down to us (for there may have been an antecedent play upon the same story) was first written by two or more playwrights, of whom Shakespeare was one; that subsequently Shakespeare re-wrote this old play, of which he was part author, making his principal changes in the passages which were contributed by his co-labourers, irrespective of the merit of what he rejected; that the play was so successful in this form as to create at once an urgent demand for an edition of it, which John Danter undertook to supply; and that, as the players were of course unwilling that the public should be enabled to enjoy their new play without going to the theatre, Danter obtained, by the aid of a reporter, who perhaps had some connection with the play in its previous form, a very imperfect and garbled copy of Shakespeare's new work, the defects in which were supplied partly by some of the many verse-mongers ever ready in those days to do such jobs, and partly from the old play...". Passages which White thought Shakespeare re-wrote for the version underlying Q2 are: the whole of II vi, the lamentations over the supposedly dead Juliet (IV v 44-67), and the Friar's long

speech at V iii 237-76. All three passages in Q1 contain lines not to be attributed to Shakespeare at any stage of his career. In the first two we have underlying Q1 parts of the older play in some lines of which the hand of a collaborator of Shakespeare is discernible;<sup>1</sup> for the third White suggests a different category -- lines 2171-83 of the Q1 version ("But he that had my Letters.....seeing Romeo dead") may possibly have been part of the speech as found in the older play, but they seem to White to be different in character from the rest of the speech in Q1, and he would assign them to "some verse-monger, who attempted to supply deficiencies in the copy surreptitiously procured for the publisher of Q1". To this verse-monger he would also attribute Q1 lines 2072-96 ("How oft to night.....The Lady sturres", corresponding to V iii 125-55); the Q1 lines are "merely an imperfect and garbled presentation" of the corresponding Q2 lines, worked up by this "verse-monger".

White's hypothesis lies midway between the unadulterated 'first sketch' theory and the theory of Tycho Mommsen,<sup>2</sup> who maintained that Q1 owed nothing to any version of the play other than that given in full in Q2: deficiencies in the surreptitiousl

1. Viz. Q1 lines 1026-33, 1044-5, 1050-1: 1850-1, 1854-5, 1864-70.  
These lines at least are unmistakably non-Shakespearian, White claims.
2. See Athenaeum, 1857, p. 182; and Romeo und Julia, Eine kritische Ausgabe des überlieferten Doppeltextes, Oldenburg, 1859.



obtained 'copy' were supplied by a hack-poet. Having mentioned contemporary complaints about stenographically pirated texts, Mommsen proceeds:

Ein solcher zusammengeflückter Nachdruck, aus Bruchstücken des ächten Textes und elenden Ergänzungen und Zusätzen von der Hand eines ziemlich ungeschickten Verfassers zusammengesetzt, liegt uns auch in Q1 vor.

(Romeo und Julia, p. 158)

Thus Mommsen would give to the hack-poet all the passages in Q1 which differ materially from the corresponding portions of the authentic edition. For myself, I find illusory the stylistic distinction posited by White between the non-Shakespearian portions of Q1 supposed to represent the older play and those supposed to be the work of the verse-monger.

Quite recently Mr H. R. Hoppe<sup>1</sup> has published an analysis of the Q1 text of II vi and of the lamentations in IV v 43 seq., showing that these passages are patchworks of fragments brought together from various points in the play by a reporter who could when necessary turn versifier on his own account. There is in these passages, then, no question of an underlying version of the play anterior to that found in Q2.

If Hoppe is right (and I find him convincing) the hypothesis of White must be modified; all that is necessary, however, is that the 'verse-monger' be given all the passages in Q1 which

---

1. See Review of English Studies, 1938, pp. 271 seq.

White quotes as having been re-written for Q2 and as containing un-Shakespearian matter. For there is no essential difference between Hoppe's theory of a reporter who in places turned versifier and the theory of Mommsen (and White) who envisaged a literary hack supplementing an imperfect reported version. It should be noticed, however, that passages attributed by Mommsen to the hack-poet can be shown to consist of tissues of reminiscences drawn from various points in the play and welded together into a generally metrical, although frequently flat and dull, verse. So complicated are these tissues in places that it certainly looks as if the versifier were using his own memory.

I do not propose to examine here the passages which Hoppe has analysed,<sup>1</sup> since his article is easily accessible. But I shall deal with the long speech of the Friar in V iii, beginning "I am the greatest able to doo least" (Q1 lines 2149-2189). This is widely different from the corresponding speech in the authentic text (V iii 231-5, 237-76). Upholders of the 'first sketch' theory would regard the Q1 version as anterior to that given in Q2, whether pre-Shakespearian or early Shakespearian. Mommsen would attribute it to the hack-poet, Hoppe to the 'reporter turned versifier'. Of the two views the

---

1. The 'anticipations' and 'recollections' which he notes in these two passages will be found, along with some others, in the notes to Q1 Romeo which follow this introduction.

latter is certainly the correct one. As we have seen, White regarded lines 2171-83 as the work of the hack, the remainder as part of the early play; but traces of memorial construction are apparent throughout, and there is no adequate ground for his stratification.

The Friar's Speech, Q1 2149 seq.

2149 This line is an exact reproduction of Q2 V iii 231.

2150 Most worthie Prince, heare me but speake the truth.:

Cf. Benvolio's narration of the imbroglio which resulted in the deaths of Mercutio and Tybalt (III i). At line 141 in Q2 Benvolio says "O Noble Prince, I can discover all:"; at line 174 "This is the truth, or let Benvolio die."; and at line 176 Lady Capulet exclaims "he speakes not true". The two situations are similar: one character describes violent events which we have witnessed on the stage: and in memorial reconstruction confusion between them is extremely possible. Another example is found in the Q1 version of III i itself: at line 150 in Q2 the Prince says "Benuolio, who began this bloudie fray?" The corresponding line in Q1 reads "Speake Benuolio who began this fray?", where there is a reminiscence of I i 97-8 (a similar narrative passage): Montague asks "Who set this auncient quarell new abroad? / Speake Nephew, were you by when it began?"

- 2151 And Ile informe you how these things fell out.: Cf. III  
iv i, where, speaking of Tybalt's death, Capulet says  
to Paris "Things haue falne out sir so vnluckily,...".
- 2152 Juliet here slaine was married to that Romeo,: This line  
runs parallel to Q2 line 239. With "that Romeo" cf.  
Q2 line 240, where "thats Romeos faithfull wife:" is  
presumably a misprint for "that Romeos....". Cf. also  
Q2 line 241 "I married them"; and with "here slaine"  
(Q2 "there dead") cf. Q2 lines 203-4 "here lies the  
County Paris slain, / And Romeo dead, and Iuliet dead  
before,".
- 2154 The Nurse was priuie to the marriage.: Cf. Q2 V iii 273  
"& to the marriage her Nurse is priuie:".
- 2156 VWas Tybalts doomesday: this corresponds exactly with the  
first part of Q2 line 242.
- 2156-7 for which Romeo / VWas banished from hence to Mantua: Cf.  
III iii 16 "Hence (Q2 misprints 'Here') from Verona  
art thou banished" (also spoken by the Friar); "hence  
banished" also occurs four lines later in that scene.  
Cf. also IV i 119 (Q2 only) "and that very night /  
Shall Romeo beare thee hence to Mantua". The two  
passages are combined.
- 2158-9 her Father sought by foule constraint/To marrie her to  
Paris: The corresponding Q2 version runs "You....  
would haue married her perforce / To Countie Paris"  
(lines 245-7): in Q1 this is confused with IV v 74

(Q2 only), where the Friar says to Capulet "The most you sought was her promotion,". Note the repetition at 2163 "VWhat so her Father sought to force her too:".

2160 (Loathing a second Contract): cf. Q2 V iii 249 "this second marriage:". The word contract occurs at II ii 121 -- "I haue no (Q1 small) ioy of (Q1 in) this contract to night,"; a recollection of this may have given rise to the phrase "second contract" with regard to the Paris-Juliet match.

2159-61 But her Soule/....did refuse/To giue consent; Cf. Q2 IV i 90-1, where the Friar instructs Juliet to "giue consent,/To marrie Paris:".

2162 to finde a meanes: this is derived from Q2 V iii 248 'deuise some meane'. But it has been confused with III v 108 -- "Find thou the means,....", (Q2 only). Cf. also Q2 V iii 300.

2164 all desperately she threatned....to dispatch her selfe.:  
Cf. Q2 V iii 271 -- "And she too desperate would not go with me: / But as it seemes, did violence on her selfe." There is probably an anticipation of a line in the next speech but one in Q2, where Balthasar says that Romeo "threatened me with death" (V iii 283); and we might also compare Q2 V i 82, where the apothecary says of the poison "if you had the strength / Of twentie men, it would dispatch you straight.

2166 Then did I.....mine arte: an almost exact reproduction of



Q2 V iii 251.

2167 A potion that should make her seeme as dead: "A potion" comes from Q2 V iii 252 ('A sleeping potion'). The remainder of the Q1 line corresponds to Q2 "it wrought on her / The form of death"; with the Q1 phraseology cf. IV i 104 (Q2 only), where the Friar describes to Juliet the effects of the potion: "Each part....Shall stiffe and starke, and cold appeare like death".

2168 with all post speed: also 2176 Romeo....returnde in post: Cf. V i 21 (Q2 only) "And presently tooke poste to tell it you:", and ibid. 26 (do.) "And hire post horses,".

2169-70 Send hence to Mantua for her Romeo,  
That he might come and take her from the Toombe.

The corresponding passage in the Q2 speech runs:-

meane time I writ to Romeo  
That he should hither come as this dire night  
To help to take her from her borrowed graue,...  
(V iii 254-6)

The second of the two Q1 lines is clearly derived from this; in considering the first we must look back at Q1 lines 1725-6, where the Friar says to Juliet "Ile send in hast to Mantua to thy Lord, / And he shall come and take thee from thy graue." This corresponds to IV i 115-9 of the authentic text (which interestingly enough contains the phrase 'hence to Mantua' at line 119): but it contains two separate 'anticipations', viz. (i) Q2 IV i 125-6 "Ile send a Frier with speed / To Mantua, with my Letters to thy Lord." (ii) Q2 V iii 256

"To help to take her from her borrowed graue,". Q1 line 2169 appears to contain elements from Q2 IV i 125-6 and V iii 254 run together; and in addition to transferring words and phrases from other places to the long speech in V iii under discussion, the reporter(s) anticipate a phrase from the Q2 version of this speech at a much earlier point in the Q1 text. Toombe (Q1 2170) anticipates Q2 V iii 270 "And then a noyse did scare me from the Tombe".

2171 A fairly close reproduction of Q2 V iii 258.

2172-4

(Frier John)

Seeking a Brother to associate him,  
VWhereas the sicke infection remaind,  
VWas stayed by the Searchers of the Towne,...

The corresponding passage in Q2 runs "Frier John, / Was stayed by accident". This has been confused with Friar John's own narrative to Friar Laurence at V ii 5-12: I quote the Q1 version (lines 1974-9):

Going to seeke a barefoote Brother out,  
One of our order to associate mee,  
Here in this Cittie visiting the sick,  
Whereas the infectious pestilence remaind:  
And being by the Searchers of the Towne  
Found and examinde, we were both shut vp.

This is based on the corresponding Q2 version, which runs:

Going to find a barefoote brother out,  
One of our order to associate me,  
Here in this Citie visiting the sicke,  
And finding him, the Searchers of the Towne  
Suspecting that we both were in a house,  
Where the infectious pestilence did raigne,  
Seald vp the doores, and would not let vs forth,  
So that my speed to Mantua there was staid.  
(V ii 5-12).

It is the Q1 form of this passage which is recollected at 2172-4; cf. seeke Q1 2172 and 1974, find Q2 V ii 5: whereas Q1 2173 and 1977, where Q2 V ii 10: remaind Q1 2173 and 1977, did raigne Q2 V ii 10.

2175-7

But Romeo vnderstanding by his man,  
That Iuliet was deceasde, returnde in post  
Vnto Verona for to see his loue.

Cf. Q2 V iii 279-81, where Balthasar says:-

I brought my maister newes of Iuliets death,  
And then in poste he came from Mantua,  
To this same place.

Cf. also Q2 IV v 25 where the Nurse exclaims "Shees dead: deceast, shees dead, alack the day". There may also be vague recollections of III iii 152 "Go get thee to thy loue" (in a speech by Friar Laurence) and V iii 260 (Q2 only) where Laurence says that John "Returnd my letter back,".

2180-3

But when I came to take the Lady hence,  
I found them dead, and she awakt from sleep:  
Whom faine I would haue taken from the tombe,  
Which she refused seeing Romeo dead.

But when I came reproduces exactly the beginning of Q2 V iii 265.

to take the Lady hence,: one of Friar Laurence's speech-mannerisms is to refer to Juliet as 'the Lady': see Q2 IV i 4 "You say you do not know the Ladies minde?" and V iii 155 "The Lady stirres", found in Q1 at the corresponding points, lines 1639 and 2096); and II vi 16 "Here comes the Lady," transferred in Q1 to line 1652 "Heere comes the Lady to my cell": see also Q1 line

1988, quoted below.

when I came....I found them dead,: cf. Q2 V i 6 "I  
dreamt my Lady came and found me dead,".

and she awakt from sleep: cf. Q1 lines 1987-9 "Now  
must I to the Monument alone,/Least that the Ladie  
should before I come./Be wakde from sleepe." This,  
peculiar to Q1, contains a reminiscence of Q2 IV i 107  
where the Friar, describing to Juliet the effects of  
the potion, tells her that she shall seem as dead for  
forty-two hours, "And then awake as from a pleasant  
sleepe".

With line 2182 cf. line 2170 above. "Refused" is also  
repeated from earlier in the Q1 version of the speech  
(line 2160).

2184 Anone I heard the watch and then I fled,: cf. Q2 V iii  
166-7, where what the Friar is here relating actually  
takes place: "Stay not to question, for the watch is  
comming, / Come go good Iuliet, I dare no longer stay."

2185 VVhat afterhappened I am ignorant of.: this is a repeti-  
tion; cf. lines 2178-9 -- "VVhat after happened touch-  
ing Paris death, / Or Romeos is to me vnknowne at all".  
In the passages which he analyses Hoppe has noted a  
tendency on the part of his versifying reporter to re-  
peat words and phrases at quite short intervals.

2186-9 The text here is very close to that of Q2: cf. the first  
line of the speech.

It seems quite clear that this long speech in Q1 consists of fragments of the corresponding speech in the authentic text bound up with fragments remembered from various other points in the play (often words and phrases not found in Q1 in their proper places), the whole worked into metrical but very pedestrian blank verse. That Q1 here reproduces a version earlier than that given in Q2 is obviously out of the question.

It is noticeable that the great majority of these fragments are taken from other speeches of Friar Laurence or from points where he is on the stage taking part in the action. I have said that I find irresistible the impression that the hand which wrote the pedestrian verse of the Q1 speech belonged to the man whose memory was at work, combining widely separated words and phrases. As far as this speech is concerned we might tentatively suggest that not inconceivably Hoppe's actor-reporter-versifier had taken the part of Friar Laurence in an abridged version of the play in which this long description of events which the audience has already seen had been cut out. This actor, however, did have some little acquaintance with the full version, enough to remember a stray fragment or two of the long narrative speech in question. He was capable of writing respectably regular, but poetically uninspired, blank verse: and he botched up a speech, his memory darting about all the time. This is substantially Hoppe's thesis. We may put this another way, and say that Momm-sen's hack-poet may not inconceivably have been an actor who had taken the part of the Friar in a shortened version of the play



found in Q2, and who supplemented a 'report' of this shortened version as well as he could.

It has often been observed that there is no part in the 'bad' quarto of Romeo and Juliet which is consistently well reported throughout, nor is there any part consistently better reported than the others. "Conceivably," says Chambers, "more than one hand has contributed".<sup>1</sup> I think this extremely probable: all I wish to suggest here is that an actor of the Friar's part in an abridgement, who could write verse, may have been responsible for this speech in Q1, may have been one of the people responsible for the production of the Q1 text.

White attributes lines 2072-96 to the 'verse-monger'. He regards these lines as "merely an imperfect and garbled presentation" of the corresponding passage in Q2 (V iii 125-55); they have been worked into the form they take in Q1 by a hack-poet. Again reminiscences from other parts of the play are traceable. We may usefully analyse this passage here.

2073 as I did passe along.: the same expression is used in line 2052 "What said may man, when my betossed soule / Did not regard him as we past a long," where Q2 has "as we rode" (V iii 77). Cf. in the 'good' text II iii 64 where Romeo says to Friar Laurence "Ile tell thee as we passe," and III iii 155, where Laurence says to

---

1. William Shakespeare, vol. 1, p. 342.

Romeo "stay not till the watch be set, / For then  
thou canst not passe to Mantua,".

2076 Who is it that consorts so late the dead,: Cf. Q2 II i  
31-2 "he hath hid himself among these trees / To be  
consorted with the humerous night". The speaker is  
Benvolio.

2087-8 On paine of death he chargde me to be gone,  
And not for to disturbe him in his enterprize.

The corresponding lines in Q2 run (V iii 140-1):-

And fearefully did menace me with death  
If I did stay to looke on his entents.

With the Q1 version compare the following in the  
authentic text:

V iii 25-6 "I charge thee.....stand all aloofe"

do. 32 "therefore hence be gone"

do. 40 "I will be gone sir, and not trouble ye"

I i 96 "Once more on paine of death, all men depart"

do. 84, 89 where the verb 'disturb' occurs.

2089 my minde presageth ill.: Cf. Q2 V i 2, where Romeo says  
"My dreames presage some ioyfull newes at hand,".

2091 monument (Q2 V iii 149 Sepulchre): 'monument' is used in  
Q2 at III v 211, V i 18, V ii 24, V iii 131, 201, 281.  
In all cases it is the Capulets' monument.

2093 Ah me I doubt,: at V iii 44 in Q2 we have the words "and  
his intents I doubt".

what Romeo dead? The corresponding words in the Q2  
version are "Romeo, oh pale!" (V iii 152). With the

Q1 version cf. Q2 V iii 204 "And Romeo dead" and 267  
 "The Noble Paris, and true Romeo dead".

2094 what vnluckie houre (Q2 V iii 153 "what an vnkind hower"):

With the Q1 reading cf., in the authentic text, III i  
 142 "The vnluckie manage of this fatall brall" and III  
 iv 1 "Things haue falne out sir so vnluckily". It is  
 interesting to notice that the first of these lines  
 occurs immediately after a line of which a recollection  
 seems traceable at Q1 line 2150, and the second has it-  
 self been quoted in connection with line 2151 (see the  
 notes on the Friar's speech above).

It should be noted that, corresponding to Q2 V iii 143  
 "some ill vnthrifftie thing", the later quartos and the  
 folios read "some ill vnlucky thing". This is only  
 ten lines above the line corresponding to that under  
 discussion. Editors frequently adopt 'unlucky' at  
 143; but unless that reading can be shown to depend  
 on a fresh consultation of an authentic manuscript it  
 has no validity above that of a conjectural emendation.

2095 so foule a sinne (Q2 V iii 154 "this lamentable chance"):  
 the Q1 version contains an anticipation of Q2 V iii 206  
 "Search, seeke & know how this foule murder comes". Cf.  
 also V iii 62 "Put not another sin vpon my head...".

I have no doubt that White rightly regarded this passage in  
 Q1 as a botched-up representation of the corresponding passage in  
 Q2, made by some versifier. This person clearly had some

knowledge of the play, since reminiscences of other passages appear in his version of this one. It seems likely therefore that the hack-poet of Mommsen and White was an actor who could write verse; and once more we have corroboration of the existence of Hoppe's actor-reporter turned versifier on his own account.

I shall here point to only one more example of the versifier's handiwork. At Q1 lines 1221-5 we have a speech from Juliet which is quite different from that found in Q2 (III ii 59-62). Here are the two versions.

- |           |  |                          |
|-----------|--|--------------------------|
| Q1        | Ah Romeo, Romeo, what disaster hap<br>Hath seuerd thee from thy true Juliet?<br>Ah why should Heauen so much conspire with Woe,<br>Or Fate enuie our happie Marriage,<br>So soone to sunder vs by timelesse Death? | 1221<br><br><br><br>1225 |
| Q2 III ii | O break my hart, poore banckrout break at once<br>To prison eyes, nere looke on libertie.<br>Vile earth too earth resigne, end motion here,<br>And thou and Romeo presse on heauie beare.                          | 59<br><br><br>62         |

Once more we are considering a speech in Q1 which seems to bring together stray fragments from various parts of the play, worked up into passably metrical lines.

Ah Romeo, Romeo,: cf. II ii 34 "O (Q1 Ah) Romeo, Romeo,  
wherefore art thou Romeo?"

what disaster hap Cf. II iii 202: Juliet says that she is going  
to the Friar "my deare (Q1 good<sup>1</sup>) hap to tell";  
cf. also III iii 177, where the Friar, urging Romeo

---

1. Here Q1 anticipates III iii 177.

to flee to Mantua, says that the latter's servant will communicate "Euery good hap to you, that chaunces here". F. G. Hubbard,<sup>1</sup> the most recent critic to argue that Q1 presents a version of the play earlier than that behind Q2, quotes passages from older plays -- "Oh hapless hap, Oh dire and cruel fate!" (Alphonsus of Aragon, line 1560), "O heavy hap! O woe can not be told!" (Gismond of Salerne, V i 2)<sup>2</sup>. By comparisons like these he seeks to show the presence in Q1 of "antique material", part of an early Romeo and Juliet. But it is also possible that such an individual as Hoppe's actor-reporter-versifier and Mommsen and White's hack-poet or verse-monger was addicted to a type of diction found characteristically in such older plays.

thy true Juliet: cf. V iii 310 (Q2 only) "true and faithfull Iuliet". Cf. also II ii 102-3, where Juliet says "ile proue more true, / Then those (Q1 they) that haue coy-ing (Q1 more cunning) to be strange,".

Line 1223: cf. Q2 V iii 220 "What further woe conspires against mine age?" See also the next note.

Or Fate enuie our happie Marriage: cf. III ii 41, where Juliet cries "Can heauen be so enuious?"  
With 'our happie Marriage' cf. II iii 94 "For this alliance may so happie proue, / To turne your housholds rancor to pure loue."

---

1. See Wisconsin University Studies in Language and Literature, No. 19.

2. Op. cit. p.25.



timelesseDeath: cf. V iii 170 (Q2 only) "Poison I see hath  
bin his timelesse end:".

In addition we might compare lines 1222 and 1225 with III v 30, where Juliet says of the lark that "she diuideth vs": it is curious that this lies within two dozen lines of the only occurrence of the verb 'to sever' in the authentic edition. At V iii 100 (Q2 only) Romeo speaks of sundering his youth.

Leaving aside these last remarks, it seems probable that the passage under discussion, peculiar to the 'bad' quarto, is the work of some versifier who combined reminiscences of various passages in the play into a five-line speech of his own. Once again the indications are against the supposition that we have here a fragment of a Romeo and Juliet play anterior to that found in the second quarto.

## II.

THE BIBLIOGRAPHICAL LINKS BETWEEN  
THE 1st AND 2nd QUARTOS.

In the passage between I ii 57 ("Godgigoden.....") and I iii 30 ("...aleauen yeare:" Q1, "....a leuen yeares," Q2) there are certain very striking bibliographical links between the two Quartos which can hardly point to any conclusion other than that between these points Q2 was printed directly from a copy of Q1.

Critical attention was first drawn to this matter in 1879 by Robert Gericke at the end of a long article entitled "Romeo and Juliet nach Shakespeare's Manuscript" (Shakespeare Jahrbuch, vol. XIV, pp. 207 seq.: see pp. 269-72). Gericke maintained that Q2 was printed from Shakespeare's autograph, except for the passage referred to which was set up from a copy of Q1. His work in this connection was not followed up until 1926, when, in the Modern Language Review, vol. XXI, pp. 140 seq., Miss Gertrude Hjort analysed in much greater detail the bibliographical connections between the two versions of I iii 13-32 ("Ile lay fourteene.....with the Dugge"), and maintained that these pointed to the conclusion that Q2 was printed directly from Q1. A third contribution to the subject was made in 1928 by Dr W. W. Greg, who, in a lecture delivered before the British Academy,<sup>1</sup> pointed out still more indications of the bibliographical dependence of

---

1. "Principles of Emendation in Shakespeare". Reprinted in Aspects of Shakespeare, 1933. See especially pp. 144-7, 175-7.

Q2 on Q1 between I ii 57 and I iii 30.

For the sake of convenience I shall give here a list of all the pieces of evidence which have been brought forward.

Most important of all is a typographical peculiarity of exceptional interest, shared by the two Quartos. In I iii the Nurse's speeches are all set in italic type in Q1; this is also the case in Q2, with the exception of her last two speeches (both single lines -- 82 and 92) which, however, do not appear in Q1. Further, Q1 sets the Nurse's speeches in I v in italics also, but Q2 uses Roman. It should also be noted that in I iii both Quartos print the Nurse's speeches in prose-form, although they are written in verse.

Another typographical coincidence occurs at I ii 64-9, where the list of guests invited to Capulet's house is printed in italics in both Quartos, which also agree in beginning it with a two-line initial, and in referring to it in the preliminary stage-direction as a "Letter", though, as Dr Greg points out (Aspects, p. 175-6) it is not a letter at all. (This stage-direction -- "He reades the Letter" -- is printed in italics in Q1, in Roman in Q2).

In I ii 57 both Quartos read "Godgigoden". "If Q1 is indeed 'reported' copy," says Dr Greg, "the chance of its having reproduced the word literatim as in the original manuscript seems infinitesimal. (Cf. III v 172, Q1 'goddegodden', Q2 'Godigeden')." (Aspects, p. 176.)

In I ii 65 both Quartos have a proper name "Vtruuio", which

both Gericke and Greg consider a twin misprint for "Vitruuio"  
(Gericke, *op. cit.* p. 272; Greg, *Aspects*, p. 176).

Q2 I ii 70-6 presents a difficult problem to an editor of  
the play. The passage runs thus --

A faire assemblee, whither should they come?

Ser. Vp.

Ro. Whither to supper?

Ser. To our house.

Ro. Whose house?

Ser. My Maisters.

Ro. Indeed I should haue askt you that before.

(Q2)

In Q1, apart from spelling and one very small variation, the  
passage is identical:

A faire assembly, whether should they come?

Ser: Vp.

Ro: Whether to supper?

Ser: To our house.

Ro: Whose house?

Ser: My Masters.

Ro: Indeed I should haue askt thee that before.

(Q1)

Clearly there is something wrong with this. Adopting a sugges-  
tion of Warburton's, Theobald re-arranged lines 71-3 thus:

Serv. Up

Rom. Whither?

Serv. To supper; to our house.

(Compare Hanmer, who read "To supper to our house"). Daniel,  
who accepts Theobald's version in his revised edition of Q2,  
says nevertheless in a note on the passage (p. 102) "I am not  
sure....but that the snip-snap of the dialogue requires a further  
alteration, and that we should read:-

Rom. A faire assemblée: wherefore should they come?  
Ser. To supper, or, Up to supper.  
Rom. Whither?  
Ser. To our house.

Romeo's double question as to the whither of the assembly has always seemed to me suspicious". Gericke suggested another reading, viz.:-

Rom. A faire assembly: whither should they come?  
Serv. To supper.  
Rom. Whither to supper?  
Serv. To our house.  
Rom. Whose house?  
Serv. My master's.  
Rom. Indeed, I should have ask'd you that before.

"Ist das nicht vollständig der 'snip-snap of the dialogue', den Daniel mit Recht hier haben will?" he asks (op. cit. p.271). It cannot be denied that this reading is very attractive.

I am not sure that it is absolutely necessary to make any alteration in the Q2 lines apart from the punctuation. The Folios and Q5 read

Ser. Vp.  
Ro. Whither? to supper?  
Ser. To our house.  
 etc.

Doubtless this ranks as a mere conjectural emendation; but it seems a good enough emendation. Dowden (Arden edition, p.22) says "I believe that Romeo eagerly interrupts the Servant, who would have said 'Up to our house'. It is afternoon, and Romeo guesses that the invitations are for supper". (Accordingly Dowden prints a dash after the Servant's "Up"). This insertion of a question-mark after "Whither" is certainly the simplest adjustment. But the main point is that no matter what solution



we adopt, the line "Whither to supper?" cannot be right as it stands in Q2, and it is the same line as is found in Q1. The two texts therefore exhibit a corruption in common, whatever the extent of that corruption.

I ii 87 and 89 fit into a quatrain, yet both Quartos read 'fire' (Q1 "fire" Q2 "fier") at the end of line 87 and 'liars' (both Qq. "liers") at the end of line 89, missing the rhyme, and therefore again displaying corruption in common (see Aspects, p. 177).

Between I ii 57 and the end of that scene, the two Quartos agree in capitalisation in eight instances as against only three disagreements. The agreements are these: Q1 "Ladie" Q2 "Lady" (line 65), both Qq. "Neeces" (66), "Neece" (67), and "Cosen" (68), Q1 "Masters" Q2 "Maisters" (75), Q1 "Heretiques" Q2 "Here-tiques" (89), Q1 "Cristall" Q2 "Christall" (94), and Q1 "Ladies" Q2 "Ladies" (95). The disagreements are: Q1 "uncle" Q2 "Vncle" (67), Q1 "Master" Q2 "maister" (77), and Q1 "sonne" Q2 "Sun" (90).

Miss Hjort analyses I iii 14-28. She points out that in this passage the word "Lammas-tide" occurs in Q1 in Roman type, the two elements hyphenated; in Q2 both elements are likewise in Roman type, but without the hyphen. She argues that if the hyphen had been absent in the 'copy' the Q2 compositor would in all probability have set only "Lammas" in Roman, "tide" being regarded as a separate word, a common noun, and therefore set in the italics normal in the passage. She compares "Lammas Eue",

which occurs twice in the same passage in both Quartos, unhyphenated and with only the first element in Roman type. Presumably, therefore, the Q2 compositor was setting up his text from Q1, and carelessly omitted the hyphen between "Lammas" and "tide".

Miss Hjort goes on to point out that the word "she" occurs in the Q1 version of the passage seven times, spelt "she" in five instances and "shee" in two; and Q2 presents exactly the same phenomenon, with the spelling-variations at the same points. Similarly, the word "dug" occurs three times in each version, spelt "dug" twice and "Dugge" once in both texts at the same points.

Furthermore the two versions of the passage which Miss Hjort examines agree absolutely in the use of capitals, and, with only one exception, of colons and full stops.<sup>1</sup>

If she had carried her comparison two lines further, Miss

---

1. Disregarding names of persons and the beginnings of sentences the words with initial capitals are these: Lammas (line 16), Lammas Eue (18 and 21), Christian (19), Earth-quake (22), Doue-house (25: see also 29), Dugge (28). Both texts have "But" (with initial capital) after a colon ("me:" line 20), and "for" (with initial small letter) after a colon ("day:" line 24). These two colons, the only ones in the passage, agree in position in the two texts. The only disagreement in the use of full stops is in line 26, where, after the word "braine", Q1 has a semi-colon and Q2 a full stop. But Q1 capitalises the next word ("But").

Hjort would have noticed another bibliographical link which Dr Greg brings to notice: in I iii 23 Q2 has the spelling "eleuen", corresponding to Q1 "eleauen", and in line 30 Q2 has "a leuen", corresponding to Q1 "aleauen" (see Aspects, p. 177). This cannot be coincidence; the Q2 compositor must have had Q1 before him.

Finally it should be mentioned that from I ii 57 to the words "a leuen yeares" in I iii 30 the two texts have exactly the same words, apart from the one small variant already noted (I ii 76, where Q1 has "thee" and Q2 "you"). There is absolutely no room for doubt that between these points Q2 was set up directly from Q1.<sup>1</sup>

Having proved that there is one passage where Q2 was printed from Q1, Miss Hjort rushes at a conclusion. She believes that behind the whole of Q2 lies a copy of Q1 which had for this purpose been corrected and amplified throughout by comparison with an authentic manuscript, the corrections and additions being "written in the margin, between the lines, or inserted on loose slips of paper". And she continues: "Q1 must then have represented nearly the same difficulties to the Q2 compositor as a

---

1. That the links between Q1 and Q2 cannot be explained as the result of derivation from the same manuscript will appear obvious later on in this chapter, when we come to consider the reason for the italics in the Nurse's part in Q1 I iii and I v.

Shakespearean manuscript crowded with revisions; only it would be so much the easier to set from as it was a book and not a manuscript".

Dr Greg points out that "the textual evidence for a bibliographical connection between the quartos is confined to sheet B of Q1" (Aspects, p. 176). And he offers a hypothesis very much more probable than that of Miss Hjort. He writes (op. cit. pp. 144-5): "It seems clear that some editor was commissioned to prepare the copy for an authorized quarto, and for this purpose was provided with the 1597 edition and a playhouse manuscript. He began by taking the printed text and elaborately correcting and expanding it by comparison with the manuscript, but when he got to the end of sheet B he decided that it would be less trouble to make a transcript of the latter. This he proceeded to do through the remainder of the play, though I will not say that he may not have used other fragments of the printed text, and I am certain that he consulted it on occasions when the manuscript was obscure." When one considers the great amount of divergence between the two Quartos in the later parts of the play it becomes clear that Dr Greg's theory gives very much less trouble to both 'editor' and compositor of Q2 than that of Miss Hjort.

In addition to this, however, it is possible to prove that Miss Hjort is wrong. In II i 14 Q2 has the name "Abraham: Cupid"; it appears in exactly the same form at the corresponding point in Q1. Dr Greg declares that "two things are evident,

namely that this as it stands cannot be correct, and that the second quarto must have copied it from the first" (Aspects, p. 147). But only three lines above this, Q2 has the line "Crie but ay me, prouaunt, but loue and day", where 'prouaunt' and 'day' are misreadings of very careless handwriting. Q1 gives the correct readings -- "Pronounce but Loue and Doue". Apparently therefore Q2 cannot at this point have been set up from Q1 even in a corrected state, but from an ill-written manuscript, or a transcript of an ill-written manuscript; and assistance was derived from a copy of Q1 only for the form of the name "Abraham: Cupid".

I suppose that Miss Hjort's position might be defended (rather desperately) by the suggestion that the person responsible for correcting and amplifying Q1 by comparison with an authentic manuscript thought that that manuscript read "prouaunt" and "day", and therefore deleted Q1's perfectly correct "Pronounce" and "Doue", substituting the two misreadings! This defence is definitely strained: and there is more to be said against it in a moment.

I find great difficulty in accepting even Dr Greg's much more reasonable hypothesis that Q2 was set up from a corrected copy of Q1 up to the end of the second sheet. There appear to me to be strong arguments against this.

In the first place, compare the two versions of I iii 53-4:

Q1: Iul. It is an honor that I dreame not off.  
Nurse: An honor! were not I etc.

Q2: Iuliet. It is an houre that I dreame not of.  
Nurse. An houre, were not I etc.



That the Q2 "houre" is twice repeated indicates that this is not an accidental misprint due to negligence; it can only be a misreading. It is a "minim-misreading"; it must have its source in a manuscript written by someone who did not distinguish sufficiently clearly between concave and convex curves: 'u' and 'n' are exceedingly easy to confuse in such a hand. This twice-repeated misreading could not, of course, have occurred had the Q2 compositor been using Q1 as 'copy' here.

Again, compare the two versions of I ii 29:

Q1                                 ....euen such delights  
Amongst fresh female buds shall you this night  
Inherit at my house,....

Q2                                 ....euen such delight  
Among fresh fennell buds shall you this night  
Inherit at my house,....

"Female" is unquestionably the correct reading; and "fennell" is probably a misreading of "female" written in the handwriting of someone who was careless about the formation of minims (it is cited as such by Professor Dover Wilson in Shakespeare's Hand in 'Sir Thomas More', p. 117). It would seem, therefore, that at I ii 29 Q2 was being set up, not from a copy of Q1 (which has the correct reading clearly printed), but from ill-written manuscript 'copy'.

Now we must deal with the argument already mentioned, that at both these points Q2 was printed from a corrected copy of Q1, that the corrector thought that the authentic manuscript before him read "houre" and "fennell", and deleted the correct readings in Q1, substituting the misreadings, which thus found

their way into Q2.

Amongst the evidence for the bibliographical dependence of Q2 upon Q1 was the reproduction in the former of errors and misprints in the latter. Manifestly, if Q2 was set up from a corrected copy of Q1 up to the end of sheet B in that text, these errors in Q1 had not been corrected. The first of the bibliographical links between the two Quartos occurs in I ii 57 ("Godgigoden") and the last in sheet B (the spelling "aleauen/a leuen"). Between these points Q2 reproduces three mistakes of Q1 -- "Vtruuio" (I ii 65), "Whither to supper?" (ibid 72), and "fier" (ibid 87). The only variations in reading between the Quartos are (1) Q2's omission of "and" between "Rosaline" and "Liulia" (I ii 68): the copula is present in Q1, and seems to be rendered desirable for metrical reasons; it is easy to suppose that the Q2 compositor accidentally omitted it: (2) the substitution of "you" in Q2 I ii 76, for Q1's "thee". I think it very far from necessary to assume that this alteration is to be traced to correction of Q1 by comparison with an authentic manuscript: it may quite well be attributed to the Q2 compositor. Carrying a group of words in his head, he may easily have substituted "you" for "thee". He may even have caught sight of the two "you's" in the next speech and consciously altered "thee" to "you". We must reckon with two points: (1) in the only passage which has been proved to have been printed from Q1, Q2 retains uncorrected certain corruptions of the earlier edition, and (2) the single alteration in wording may easily be attributed

to the compositor of Q2 himself. We may take it as established that the only passage in Q2 which has been proved to have been printed from Q1 was printed from Q1 in an uncorrected state. This being so, I think it over-daring to assume that at other points, where the two Quartos differ, Q2 was set up from a corrected copy of Q1. The existence of the corrector has not been proved; moreover, there is good reason for suspecting that no corrector existed, since none was involved in the one Q1 passage which certainly underlies Q2.

If, therefore, it is suggested that the Q2 misprints "fennell" for "female" (I ii 29), "houre" for "honor" (I iii 52 and 54), "prouaunt" for "pronounce" and "day" for "Doue" (II i 11) can be explained by assuming that someone correcting a copy of Q1 by collations with an authentic manuscript misread that manuscript, stupidly deleted the correct readings in Q1, and substituted his own misreadings, I would reply that the existence of this corrector has not been proved. We are therefore entitled to take the misreading "houre" in Q2 I iii 53-4 as indicating that at some point between this and the words "a leuen yeares" (I iii 30) the Q2 compositor had abandoned Q1 as 'copy' and taken up manuscript 'copy'. But the second appearance of "houre" for "honor" in Q2 occurs in a speech of the Nurse's, which is printed in italics, as are her next two speeches. Presumably, therefore, the Q2 compositor, having started setting the Nurse's part in italics at the beginning of the scene because it was printed so in his 'copy', continued doing so for some time

after he had abandoned Q1 as 'copy'. Probably either he or the master-printer realised the absurdity of the procedure between the setting up of I iii 65 (which is in italics) and I iii 82 (which is in Roman).

I believe that we can determine the exact point in I iii at which the Q2 compositor abandoned Q1. The last phrase which we can be fairly sure was set up from Q1 is "a leuen yeares" (line 30). Let us examine the Q1 text of the scene after that point.

That text immediately deteriorates. Whereas (put into metrical lining) Q2 runs --

For then she could stand hy lone, nay by th'roode,  
She could haue run and wadled all about:

(I iii 30-1)

Q1 can only be divided clumsily if anything like metrical structure is to be maintained:

For then could Iuliet stande high lone, nay  
By the Roode shee could haue wadled up and downe,...

The impression that the Q1 version reads like a weak memorial reconstruction of that presented correctly by Q2 is strengthened if it is actually the case that the variant "up and downe" is an anticipation of II v 50 (also in the Nurse's part), where we have

Beshrewe your heart for sending me about  
To catch my death with iaunsing vp and downe.

That this passage is not reproduced in Q1 II v does not preclude the possibility of its having been vaguely present in the mind of a memorial reconstructor at a much earlier point in the play. This is especially so if we accept Mr H. R. Hoppe's hypothesis

that "perhaps the reporter (or reporters) had once acted in a full-length version that represented the drama substantially in its Q2 form; subsequently he had participated in a shortened version. When he came to report the play, he tried to reconstruct it in its complete form, but he could recall vividly only the shortened tragedy he had recently taken part in, the passages omitted from the longer version surviving occasionally as tags imbedded elsewhere in the text, usually where the context or situation is similar." (R.E.S. 1938, p. 275.)

Within a few lines we have another passage which strongly suggests memorial reconstruction. Q2 reads --

...doest thou fall upon thy face? thou wilt fall backward when thou hast more wit,....

while Q1 has this:

...Dost thou fall forward, Iuliet? thou wilt fall backward when thou hast more wit:....

It looks as if the memorial reconstructor remembered that the phrase "thou wilt fall backward etc." was prefixed by its opposite, the exact phrasing of which, however, he failed to recollect. What more natural than that he should oppose "forward" to "backward"?

A little further on we find that two separate pieces of the authentic speech as found in Q2 are completely mixed up in Q1 in such a way as to make it impossible to come to any conclusion other than that the Q1 version is the result of imperfect memorial reconstruction. Compare these two passages in Q2 with the corresponding ones in Q1:-



Q2 (1) ...the pretie wretch left crying, and said I:

(2) ...and pretie foole it stinted, and said I;

Q1 (1) ...the pretty foole left crying and said I.

(2) ...and by my troth she stinted and cried I.

In position, Q1 (1) corresponds to Q2 (1), Q1 (2) to Q2 (2).

There can be no doubt that this confusion indicates an imperfect memory at work. This being so it is probable that the Q1 "Iuliet" in place of the Q2 "Iule" (I iii 35, 38) is likewise to be attributed to the method of transmission of this part of the Q1 text and not to a Shakespearian revision. The Q1 reading is a sort of vulgarisation; for the delightful suggestion contained in this single vocative in Q2 as to the character and ways of the garrulous old man is lost in the reported text, which substitutes the actual name Juliet devoid of these connotations.

In place of the Nurse's words "Peace I haue done" (I iii 47) Q1 has "Well go thy waies". This is almost certainly an anticipation of II v 40, where the Nurse herself, talking in this case also to Juliet, says "go thy wayes wench...".

At Lady Capulet's speech (Q2 I iii 50-2) the Q1 reporter throws up the sponge. The metrical structure of the speech is utterly lost, and the text degenerates to mere summary. Q1 has in this scene presented us up to this point with nothing nearly so bad. Compare the two versions:

Q2: Marrie, that marrie is the very theame  
I came to talke of, tell me daughter Iuliet,  
How stands your dispositions to be married?

Q1: And that same marriage Nurce, is the Theame/I meant to  
talke of: Tell me Iuliet, howe stand you af-/fected to be  
married?

Moreover, the next speech of Lady Capulet's is likewise a mere shell. In place of the six metrical lines of Q2 (I iii 56-61) Q1 has only --

Well girle, the Noble Countie Paris seekes / thee for his  
Wife.

This is composed of stray recollections of the Q2 speech ("Well thinke of marriage now,.....The valiant Paris seekes you for his loue" -- the first and last lines of the speech). And "the valiant Paris" has become "the Noble Countie Paris", possibly through an anticipation of Q2 V iii 75 where we have "Mercutio's kinsman, noble County Paris". Not only is it obvious that Q1 depends on memory from I iii 30 to the end of the scene; clearly that memory retained much more of the Nurse's part than of Lady Capulet's which is filled in perfunctorily.

In the Q1 version of I iii, then, there is a memorial element in the transmission of the text from the words "for then could Iuliet stande high lone" to the end. Let us now consider the text of the scene up to that point. Was the transmission of this also memorial?

Here we must face the problem of the Nurse's italics. Italic type was used mainly as a differentiation-type (see McKerrow, Introduction to Bibliography, p. 296). Of its use here in the Nurse's part Dr Greg says: "Whatever the explanation of this, I can recall nothing analogous in the whole of the Elizabethan drama: it is something quite peculiar and individual" (Aspects of Shakespeare, p. 176). We are confronted with a really difficult puzzle.

"In the later years of the sixteenth century," writes Dr McKerrow (op. cit. p. 251), "it seems to have been a common practice, though to what extent it was the usual one I cannot say, in MSS. written in the English hand to insert proper names and foreign quotations in an Italian hand; this practice of course corresponding to that of printing such things in italic type in a roman text. The question therefore arises to what extent italics are likely to represent words in an Italian hand....". The matter is thus left in doubt; little seems to be known on the subject. But I can see no explanation for the printing of the Nurse's speeches in italics in Q1 I iii and I v, other than that the typographical distinction corresponds to an orthographical distinction in the 'copy' for that edition.

The Nurse's appearance at the beginning of I iii is her first appearance in the play; the typographical peculiarity with which we are concerned starts therefore at the beginning of her part.

Any hypothesis advanced to explain this unique phenomenon must of necessity be stated tentatively. With this qualification I would suggest the following theory as at least very possible.

The person or persons responsible for preparing the 'copy' for Q1 possessed a small fragment of the Nurse's 'part' or of a transcript of that 'part'. This was written in an Italian hand. Evidence of memorial reconstruction in the Nurse's speeches begins with the passage "for then could Iuliet stande high lone,..." but before this point there is nothing to suggest memorial

reconstruction in the Nurse's part in I iii -- the deterioration is extraordinarily sudden. I suggest, therefore, that the fragment of the Nurse's 'part' available to the compiler(s) of the Q1 text extended from the beginning of that part to the words "it is aleauen yeare:" (I iii 30). This fragmentary 'part' would presumably have spaces between the separate speeches. I believe that the interspersed speeches of Lady Capulet and Juliet (corresponding to Q2 I iii 1, 5, 7, 8-11, 13, 17) were inserted into the fragment by the compiler(s) of the Q1 'copy' in an English hand,<sup>1</sup> and that the fragment itself was then pasted into the manuscript which was being prepared for the printer of Q1. In this way there would be present in the manuscript 'copy' for Q1 a passage in which the Nurse's speeches were written in an Italian hand, the interspersed speeches of the other characters being in an English hand. If the Q1 compositor was in the habit of seeing such orthographical differentiations in copy with respect to proper names, foreign quotations, and so on, and of reproducing these differentiations in type, he might easily set the Nurse's speeches in italics and those of the other speakers in roman when faced with such 'copy' as has been suggested.

- 
1. The 'part' would also presumably contain cue-words, written in an Italian hand; these may have been deleted when the intervening speeches by the other characters were filled in. One of these intervening speeches is  $3\frac{1}{2}$  lines long in Q1 (that corresponding to Q2 I iii 8-11); it may have been inserted up and down the margin of the fragmentary 'part', with its proper position in the text clearly indicated.

authorized quarto was entrusted produced that 'copy' by transcribing an authentic manuscript: he had a copy of Q1 by him: finding that between I ii 57 and I iii 30 the Q1 text was excellent,<sup>1</sup> he tore the two leaves out of his copy of Q1, drew his pen through the first fourteen<sup>2</sup> lines of sig. B3r (this includes a stage-direction) and through the material on sig. B4v from "for then could Iuliet...." to the foot of the page. Then he put the two leaves amongst the pages of his transcription, having saved himself the labour of copying in all  $84\frac{1}{2}$  lines (including stage-directions). This is the only reasonable hypothesis I can find to agree with all the requirements.

As regards the bibliographical relationship between the two quartos there are other points to reckon with. We have already seen how, as Dr Greg pointed out, the 'editor' of the Q2 'copy' consulted Q1 for the form of the name "Abraham: Cupid" (II i 14). Was Q1 consulted at any other point subsequent to the first two sheets?

In their article on the 'bad' quarto of Romeo in the Times Literary Supplement, August 14th 1919, Professors Pollard and Dover Wilson compared two passages in Q2 with the corresponding

---

1. But he failed to notice three errors in I ii.
2. If Q2 I ii 57 was the first line set from Q1 the editor of the 'copy' for Q2 cancelled the first nineteen lines on Q1 sig. B3r. But the two Qq. are identical from I ii 52 on ("For your broken shin...").



passages in Q1, and observed how the two texts agreed in capitalisation and punctuation.

1. III v 27 seq.:

Q2: It is the Larke that sings so out of tune,  
Straining harsh Discords, and vnpleasing Sharpes.  
Some say, the Larke makes sweete Diuision:  
This doth not so: for she diuideth vs.  
Some say the Larke and loathed Toad change eyes,  
O now I would they had changd voyces too:  
Since arme from arme that voyce doth vs affray,  
Hunting thee hence, with Huntsup to the day.

Q1: It is the Larke that sings so out of tune,  
Straining harsh Discords and vnpleasing Sharpes.  
Some say, the Larke makes sweete Diuision:  
This doth not so: for this diuideth vs.  
Some say the Larke and loathed Toad change eyes,  
I would that now they had changd voyces too:  
Since arme from arme her voyce doth vs affray,  
Hunting thee hence with Huntsvp to the day.

In these two versions exactly the same words have initial capitals; and the colons appear at exactly the same points, as do the full stops. We cannot believe that a memorial reconstructor could reproduce the capitalisation and punctuation of the authentic manuscript! Pollard and Dover Wilson maintain that the two versions are derived from the same manuscript, at different stages of development (the variants are due to a Shakespearian revision between the two stages). Their hypothesis is that behind Q1 here lies a transcript of the manuscript at its earlier stage; the revision was carried out in the manuscript itself, which underlies Q2. This would certainly explain the connection between the two versions of this passage. But what about the Nurse's italics? Can we imagine a Shakespearian manuscript in which there was an orthographical

distinction between the Nurse's first speeches and those of the other characters? If we accepted the Pollard-Wilson theory we should have to do so; and we should have to imagine that the person who made the abridged transcript of the partially-revised manuscript reproduced that orthographical distinction, and that the compositors of both quartos reproduced the distinction. Surely the only credible explanation is that Q2 copied the typographical distinction direct from Q1, and that the Q1 compositor had reproduced in type an orthographical distinction in a manuscript which was composite, consisting of a fragmentary 'part' in one kind of handwriting with speeches by other characters interpolated in another kind of handwriting? And if the Q2 compositor copied the Nurse's italics from Q1 (because the 'editor' of the 'copy' for Q2 had included two leaves of Q1 in that 'copy') is not the most reasonable explanation of the agreement between the two quartos in capitalisation and punctuation at III v 27 seq. to be sought in a similar hypothesis? But in this case all we need suppose is that the scribe responsible for the Q2 'copy', having Q1 beside him, and finding it substantially accurate here, copied these lines from it, incorporating in his transcription a correction or two from the authentic manuscript which he also had beside him.

2. The same hypothesis would fit the other passage in which Professors Pollard and Dover Wilson have shown a close connection between the two Quartos, viz. II iv 35-40.

Q2: O flesh, flesh,/how art thou fishified? now is he for the numbers that Petrarch/flowed in: Laura to his Lady, was a kitchin wench, marrie/she had a better loue to berime her: Dido a dowdie, Cleopatra/a Gipsie, Hellen and Hero, hildings and harlots: Thisbie a grey/eye or so, but not to the purpose.

Q1: O flesh flesh/how art thou fishified. Sirra now is he for the numbers that/Petrarch flowdin: Laura to his Lady was but a kitchin/drudg, yet she had a better loue to berime her: Dido a dow-/dy Cleopatra a Gypsie, Hero and Hellen hildings and harle-/tries: Thisbie a gray eye or so, but not to the purpose.

In both versions we find that (1) all the proper names are italicised except those of Dido and Cleopatra; (2) the same words have initial capitals; (3) the colons appear in exactly the same positions.

Having mentioned the Pollard-Wilson hypothesis we may note here the salient objections to it, apart from that already noticed. According to that hypothesis the 'copy' for Q1 consisted of an abridged transcript of an early Romeo play only partially revised by Shakespeare, with interpolations made from memory by an actor who had played in the fully revised play. I would point out three objections to this, the first two of which at least are serious.

1. According to the Pollard-Wilson theory, signs of memorial transmission would be found only in those portions of the Q1 text which were contributed by the interpolating actor. But the line-by-line notes on Q1 which will be found hereafter show that the text is positively crammed with signs of such transmission (just as much in passages which are metrically and structurally

perfect as in passages where the structure breaks down). If we attribute to the interpolating actor all the lines which contain marks of memorial reconstruction, then the transcript must have been a document of amazing brevity.

2. According to this theory, passages in the later acts of Q1 which diverge decidedly from Q2 must be portions of the early Romeo play which Shakespeare had not yet re-worked during the partial revision of that play. Yet in the first section of this introduction, and in the notes on the Q1 version of the marriage-scene (II vi) and the lamentations (IV v), it is clearly shown that these portions of the Q1 text also depend on memory and cannot represent any authentic stage in the text-history of the play.

3. Act I scene iii. Professors Pollard and Dover Wilson do not consider that Q2 was here printed from Q1; they argue that Q1 was printed from a transcript of the manuscript which at a later stage in its development formed the 'copy' for Q2. We are therefore justified, according to their hypothesis, in comparing the two texts of this scene line by line. We find that the Q1 text is a word-perfect reproduction of the final Shakespearian text up to the phrase "it is aleauen yeare:" (the middle of a sentence), and that not only does it immediately diverge from Q2 after that point but also begins immediately to display the decisive marks of memorial transmission. Thus the Q1 text of the scene from the words "for then could Iuliet...." on must

be the work of the interpolating actor. Presumably, then, we are to suppose that during his first partial revision Shakespeare brought I iii up to its final state only as far as the words "aleauen yeare"; and that during the later revision he started to re-work the scene from the exact point where he had previously left off. But there are scenes after I iii in which the Q1 text is very close to that of Q2. So we have to imagine a rather curious type of partial revision: Shakespeare has apparently revised half a scene (I iii 1-30) in such a way that he did not need to touch it again at the later revision, and has then proceeded to some other scene. Is this very probable?



## III.

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON THE 'COPY' FOR Q2.

There are one or two points in Q2 where I think we may find corroboration of the theory that the 'copy' was prepared by a transcriber who copied an authentic manuscript. Professor Dover Wilson has shown that the 'copy' for the Folio text of Hamlet was a transcription of the prompt-book, made by someone who knew the play, who occasionally allowed his memory to usurp the function of his eye, and who at certain points introduced into his transcription anticipations and recollections of later and earlier passages in the play.<sup>1</sup> Occasionally we may detect a similar habit in the transcriber responsible for the 'copy' for Q2 Romeo and Juliet.

1. Compare the two versions of II ii 32-3:

Q1 When he bestrides the lasie pacing cloudes,  
And sailes vpon the bosome of the aire.

Q2 When he bestrides the lazie puffing Cloudes,  
And sayles vpon the bosome of the ayre.

I cannot find any editor who disagrees with Pope's adoption of the Q1 reading here. White liked the Q2 reading, but followed Q1 in his text. He comments: "'The lazie puffing cloudes' affords such picturesque propriety of description that it is only after much hesitation that I adopt the reading of Q1, suggestive

---

1. See The Manuscript of Shakespeare's 'Hamlet', vol. 1, p. 50 seq.

as that is; for the lazy puffing clouds are the slow-moving cumuli that puff themselves out into swelling breasts of rose-tinted white, and so have seemed to many a dreamy eye 'the bosom of the air'. But the epithet 'lazy-pacing', aside from its beauty, has a strong hold in the word 'bestrides', which precedes it...." (Furness, Variorum ed. Romeo, p. 96).

If the Q2 reading is corrupt, as all editors suppose it to be, how did the corruption arise? Collier (in his 1842 edition) suggested that possibly "in the manuscript from which Q2 was printed 'lazy-pacing' was written 'lazy-passing', and the compositor misread the two long s's for a double 'f'" (Furness, p.96). But I believe that there is a better explanation of the occurrence of 'lazy-puffing' here in Q2. Compare the passage with Q2 I iv 90 seq., where Mercutio talks of dreams as

Begot of nothing but vaine phantasie:  
Which is as thin of substance as the ayre.  
And more inconstant then the wind who wooes,  
Euen now the frozen bosome of the North:  
And being angered puffes away from thence.....

Notice the close parallel between II ii 33 "the bosome of the ayre" and I iv 93 "the bosome of the North" (and the word "ayre" itself occurs in I iv 91. The two passages could easily be confused by someone who knew the play. I suggest in short that when the transcriber responsible for the Q2 'copy' was writing II ii 32 he unconsciously altered "lazier-pacing" to "lazier puffing" owing to a recollection of the closely similar passage at I iv 90 seq., a passage which contains the word "puffes" (line 94).

## 2. At II ii 201 Q2 reads

Hence will I to my ghostly Friers close cell  
while the corresponding line in Q1 runs

Now will I to my Ghostly fathers Cell.

The great majority of editors follow Capell, who first read

Hence will I to my ghostly father's cell.

Of the Q2 reading Dr Greg says that "it can only have originated, one supposes, in inability to decipher the playhouse manuscript" (Aspects of Shakespeare, p. 146). Perhaps the transcriber of that manuscript was influenced by an unconscious anticipation of Q2 V iii 263, where the Friar tells of his intention to keep Juliet "closely at my Cell".

## 3. At III i 118 Q2 has a curious reading:

He gan in triumph and Mercutio slaine,....

Q1 has in place of this

A liue in tryumph and Mercutio slaine?

The great majority of editors follow Q1 here. Qq. 3 and 4 have "He gon...", as have Ff. 1 and 2. Q5 and Ff. 3 and 4 have "He gone....", and Rowe follows F4. The only other editor to read "He gone in triumph" is Ulrici; Capell emended to "Again? in triumph?"

Q2's "gan" is probably a misreading of "gon" (i.e. "gone"). The antithesis "A liue / slaine" is distinctly in favour of the Q1 version. I would suggest that the transcriber responsible for the Q2 'copy' was influenced by a recollection of Mercutio's

words at III i 88 -- "Is he gone and hath nothing".

4. Compare the two versions of II ii 44-5:

Q1                           That which we call a Rose,  
By any other name would smell as sweet:

Q2                           that which we call a rose,  
By any other word would smell as sweet,....

The Q2 reading is reproduced in all the later Qq. and the Ff.. Rowe follows F4. The only other editors to adopt "word" in their texts are Ulrici and Staunton. I have no doubt that the vast majority of editors is correct in regarding "name" as the genuine reading. And I suggest that the transcriber behind the Q2 text substituted "word" through an unconscious anticipation of II ii 59, where Romeo says of his own name --

Had I it written, I would teare the word.

5. At II ii 109 Q2 reads:

Lady, by yonder blessed Moone I vow,...

The corresponding line in Q1 runs:

By yonder blessed Moone I sweare,...

"Vow" is adopted by the editors from Pope to Johnson, and after them only by Capell, Delius, Staunton, Daniel. Malone first adopted the Q1 variant, which is generally accepted. Juliet's reply -- "O swear not by the moone" -- seems to require "swear" in the immediately preceding speech. Delius considered that "the ascent from vow to swear in Juliet's reply seems to have been intended by the poet" (see Furness, p. 103): but her whole emphasis is upon the word moone, and any alteration of the verb

seems quite gratuitous. I believe that the scribe responsible for the Q2 'copy' wrote "vow" by an unconscious anticipation of II ii 131 --

Iuli. What satisfaction canst thou haue to night?  
Ro. Th'exchange of thy loues faithful vow for mine.

Notice may be taken here of an undoubted corruption in the Q2 version of V iii. In the stage-direction after line 21 we have "Enter Romeo and Peter". Speeches are assigned to "Pet." at lines 40 and 43. (At the corresponding points in Q1 Romeo's companion is Balthasar: see Q1 line 2005 S.D., and lines 2024 and 2027). After the entry of the Friar in Q2 V iii the speeches of Romeo's companion are assigned to "Man." (lines 127, 132, 134, 136, 138, 144). After line 189 we have the stage-direction "Enter Romeo's man", and at line 279 a speech is assigned to "Balth." (i.e. Balthasar). In Q2 V iii, then, this character begins as Peter and ends as Balthasar. Quite clearly Balthasar is the character required throughout; and the only explanation that I can see for the confusion of names is that originally advanced by Collier -- that possibly Kemp doubled the parts of Peter and Balthasar (see Furness, p. 271). Possibly the person who was transcribing the playhouse manuscript in order to furnish the Q2 compositor with 'copy' remembered performances in which a certain actor, who had played the part of Peter, entered with Romeo at V iii 21: he may therefore have substituted Peter's name in his transcript (possibly the non-committal "Romeo's man" stood in the relevant stage-direction in the



playhouse copy, with the assignations "Man." in front of lines 40 and 43). Subsequently he realised the mistake but did not correct what he had already done. It is a mistake exactly analogous to the stage-direction at the end of Q1 Hamlet, where we have "Enter Voltemar and the Ambassadors from England". Here we must assume that the part of one of the English ambassadors was taken by the actor who had in the early portion of the play taken that of Voltemar; the reporter, remembering that this actor entered here, gave him the name of his earlier part.

THE FIRST QUARTO OF 'ROMEO AND JULIET'.

NOTES.

Act I Scene 1.

## Q1 lines

- 12-13 Q1 "There's not a man of them I meete, but Ile take the wall of" Q2 "I will take the wall of any man or maide of Mountagues". Possibly the Q1 reporter's memory vaguely anticipated III i 2-3 (in Q2), where Benvolio says "the Capels (are) abroad:/And if we meete we shall not scape a brawle". This last line is omitted in Q1.
- 17-20 "thou shalt see....poore Iohn": this is misplaced -- cf. Q2 lines 27-30.
- 36-7 These lines are exactly repeated at lines 40-1.
- 42 S.D. Q1 describes the brawl in an elaborate stage-direction. Where the action is rapid and confused, the dialogue is likely to suffer in a memorial reconstruction.
- 50 Q1 "Your liues shall pay the ransome of your fault" Q2 "Your liues shall pay the forfeit of the peace". Probably the Q1 reporter has confused this line with either Titus Andronicus, III i 156 -- "And that shall be the ransom for their fault", or 2 Henry VI, III i 127 -- "And lowly words were ransom for their fault".
- Possibly the reporter remembered that "peace" occurred in the authentic text, and for this reason substituted "depart in peace" (Q1 line 51) for "depart away" (Q2 line 91).
- 51 Q1 "euery man depart" Q2 "all the rest depart": the Q1 version is probably an inexact anticipation of Q2 line 96 -- "all men depart" (corresponding to which Q1 has "each man depart" -- line 56).
- 52 Q1 "Come Capulet come you along" Q2 "You Capulet shall go along". Q1 anticipates the next line -- "And Mountague come you this afternoone".
- 63-4 Q1 "the...sunne/Peept..." Q2 "the...Sun,/Peerde...". All editors follow Q2 here, in all probability correctly. Holt White pointed out, however (see Furness, Variorum ed. Romeo, p.15), that this passage is echoed in Summa Totalis or All-in-All (Q pub. 1607): "Now heaven's bright eye (awake by Vesper's sheene)/Peepes through the purple windows of the East". Here "peepes" agrees with Q1 against Q2. This coincidence might prompt one to suggest that "peepte" was actually spoken on the stage: and Q2's

"peerde" might be explained as a result of the transcriber of the playhouse MS. confusing the passage with 1 Henry IV, V i 1 -- "How bloodily the sun begins to peer/Above yon busky hill". Chambers dates 1 Henry IV to 1597-8 (William Shakespeare, vol. 1, p.270). But this theory is advanced only as a possible view.

- 65, 69, 70 Q1 uses "drew" three times, corresponding to Q2's "driue" (line 113), "made" (117), "stole" (118). Cf. Q1 619, 624, 628, 630 where "finde" is repeated four times, corresponding to Q2 "find" (II ii 67), "see" (72), "saw" (76), "finde" (78): and also Q1 707, 708, 710 where "stay" is thrice repeated, corresponding to Q2 "stand" (II ii 178), "stand" (179), "stay" (181). Hoppe (R.E.S. 1938 p.276) comments on the reporter's fondness for repeating words, and gives other examples.
- 67 Q1 "the Citties side" Q2 "this Citie side". Malone adopted the Q1 reading; among those who follow him are the old Cambridge editors, Daniel (revised ed. of Q2), Dowden (Arden ed.), Ridley (New Temple ed.).
- 70 Q1 "And drew into the thicket (of) the wood" Q2 "And stole into the couert of the wood".
1. "thicket": the reporter may well have had at the back of his mind Love's Labour's Lost, V ii 89 ff. -- "warily/ I stole into a neighbour thicket by". This confusion would be easy, especially as the speech in L.L.L. begins with the line "Under the cool shade of a sycamore", with which cf. Romeo Q2 line 114 of this scene -- "vnderneath the groue of Syramour (misprint for 'Sycamour')" -- Q1 line 66.
  2. "drew": not inconceivably there is in the Q1 line yet another confusion with a line in another play: cf. 3 Henry VI, IV v 3 -- "Leave off to wonder why I drew you hither,/Into this chiefest thicket". That the verb is intransitive in Q1 Romeo does not necessarily invalidate this theory of its derivation.
- 72 In place of Q2 lines 120-1, Q1 has here a line peculiar to itself -- "That most are busied when th'are most alone" (qualifying "mine owne (affections)" in the previous line). Daniel (revised ed. of Q2) regarded the difference between the two Qq. as the result of revision. But it can just as well be explained on the hypotheses of Mommsen or Hoppe, by supposing that the Q2 lines were forgotten and that a versifier bridged the gap by constructing a line of his own (rhyming with the previous one). There is certainly no reason to adopt the Q1 line into the authentic text, as was done by Pope, Knight, Dyce, Staunton, and the Cowden Clarkes.

- 73, 74 Note the twice-repeated graphic error "honor" (Q2 "humor", lines 122, 134).
- 85 Q1's "sad hopes" is nonsensical. Hubbard (Wisconsin Univ. Studies, 19, p.5) regards it as a printer's error for "sad houres" (Q2 line 156). But I cannot see how it can be explained: it cannot be a graphic error, since there is in the word "houres" no letter with a long tail which could be misread as a 'p'.
- 87 Q1 "what sorrow" Q2 "what sadnesse". Probably Q1 contains here a recollection of Q2 line 147 (omitted in Q1) -- "Could we but learne from whence his sorrows grow".
- 95-6 Cf. Q2 lines 166-7. Q1 entirely misses the point of the wit. The substitution of "lawes" for "eyes" and "giue" for "see" in line 96 (Q2 167) makes the 'muffled view' of the preceding line an isolated detail in Q1, with no real significance in the context. In Q2 the words "view, muffled, eyes, see" form a coherent sequence. Q1's "our will" (Q2 "his will") also betrays lack of comprehension.
- 101 Q1 "create" Q2 "created". (Ff. 2-4 agree with Q1). The old Cambridge editors are among those who adopt the Q1 reading here. This results in an isolated rhyming couplet. Metrically there is nothing wrong with "created". Hoppe (R.E.S. 1938 p.278) finds in the Q1 reporter "a fondness for creating gratuitous rimes".
- 103 Q1 "best seeming thinges" Q2 "welseeing formes". We must emend Q2 to "well-seeming forms", but there is no reason to regard more than the word "seeming" as genuine in the Q1 phrase.
- 112 Q1 "at my hart" Q2 "in my breast". The speech is rhymed, and the Q1 corruption destroys a rhyming couplet. Probably the Q1 reading is the result of a recollection of "thy good harts oppression" (Q2 line 181, Q1 110).
- 114 Q1 "this griefe" Q2 "this loue". Q1 anticipates the next line ("Doth ad more griefe....").
- 116 Q1 "raisde" Q2 "made". Pope adopted the Q1 reading, and among those who follow him are Furness, the old Cambridge editors, Dowden, Ridley.
- 118 Q1 "a sea raging with a louers teares" Q2 "a sea nourisht with louing teares". "Louing teares" is in all probability corrupt: possibly the transcriber who produced the 'copy' for Q2 unconsciously anticipated Q2 line 210 -- "the siege of louing tearmes". Pope read "lovers tears", and the



correct reading is almost certainly "lovers' tears".  
 "raging": Ridley adopts the Q1 variant here; and Daniel also inclined to it. But it is probably an anticipation of III v 136 ff., where Capulet admonishes Juliet for her constant weeping:

For still thy eyes, which I may call the sea,  
 Do ebbe and flowe with teares, the Barke thy body is:  
 Sayling in this salt floud, the windes thy sighes,  
 Who raging with thy teares and they with them,  
 Without a sudden calme will ouerset  
 Thy tempest tossed body.

- 128 Q1 "Bid a sickman in sadnes make his will": this must be adopted in place of the Q2 line which is corrupt -- "A sicke man in sadnesse makes his will". F2 attempts a correction by inserting "good" before "sadnesse", but this is a mere conjecture and can be ignored.
- 131 Q1 "I aimde so right" Q2 "I aymde so neare". Both of the next two lines contain the word "right" (in a different sense) and it might be argued that in setting up line 131 the Q1 compositor's eye caught the word up too soon. But I would rather suggest that the reporter is responsible for the corruption, which is probably an anticipation of II iii 42, where the Friar says "then here I hit it right" (Q1 line 761).
- 137 Q1 "Cupids childish bow" Q2 "loues weak childish bow". Q1 contains a recollection of Q2 lines 206-7 (Q1 134-5) -- "sheel not be hit / With Cupids arrow".  
 Q1's "vnharm'd" is definitely preferable in the context to Q2's "vncharmd".
- 138 Q1 "Shee'le not abide the siedge of louing tearmes" Q2 "Shee will not stay the siege of louing tearmes". Q1 contains a trace here of Q2 line 211, which it omits ("Nor bide th'incounter of assailing eies").

Act I Scene ii.

- 142-3 Immediately before this there is an omission of three lines (Q2 I ii 1-3). Chambers lists this amongst the omissions of material necessary to the sense (William Shakespeare, vol. 1, p. 341). The omitted lines contain a reference to the Prince's composition of the strife between the Capulets and Montagues: this gives point to the preterite "liu'd" in Q2 line 5. Q1 on the other hand has the present "liue" (143): moreover Paris uses the pronoun "they" twice (142, 143) although he is addressing one of the parties concerned. Clearly the reporter was not thinking of the correct situation when he wrote these two lines. Note the absence of the speech-heading in front of line 142 (Paris).
- 144-5 Q1 "(Paris) But leauing that, what say you to my sute? Cap. What should I say more than I said before," Q2 "(Paris) But now my Lord, what say you to my sute? Cap. But saying ore what I haue said before." There appears to be a confusion in the Q1 version with Richard III, V iii 314 -- "What should I say more than I have inferred?" Cf. also Richard III, III vii 108 -- "But leaving this, what is your Grace's pleasure?" For other echoes of Richard III see Q1 lines 1025, 1046, 1871. See Hoppe, R.E.S. 1938, pp. 279, 282-3.
- 146 Q1 "My daughter...." Q2 "My child....yet....". Capulet is talking of Juliet's age in relation to her marriage. With the Q1 variant cf. I iii 10 (Q1 246-7) where Lady Capulet talks on the same subject (although from a different point of view) and says to the Nurse "Thou knowest my daughters of a prettie age".
- 147-9 Cf. Q2 lines 9-11. Q2 carries through consistently the metaphor of the seasons -- "seen the change of fourteen years, two more summers wither, ripe to be a bride". Q1 on the other hand, reproducing the second element in this sequence (line 148), uses common phraseology, unconnected with the basic figure, at the other two points -- "attainde to fourteene yeares, fit for a Bride". So in Q1 the image of two more summers withering is isolated, is not fused into the context. An exactly similar case has been mentioned in the note on Q1 lines 95-6.
- 151 Q1 "married" Q2 "made". Ulrici, Singer (2nd ed.), Hudson, and Collier read "married", White reads "marri'd". See Furness, Variorum ed., p.31. Steevens points out a parallel in Puttenham's Art of Poesy -- "The maid that soon married is, soon marred is" -- and notes that the expression

seems to be proverbial. The full effect of the "marred/married" pun depends, of course, on the disyllabic pronunciation of both words. But White notes a parallel in All's Well II iii 314-5 -- "Why, these balls bound; there's noise in it. 'Tis hard:/A young man married is a man that's marr'd" -- and says that the contraction of "marred" to one syllable "for rhyme's sake, would not destroy the little joke for an ear accustomed to the full sound of both words". Singer (2nd ed.) refers to yet another parallel, where "marred" is likewise a monosyllable: "You're to be marr'd or married, as they say" (from Flecknoe's Epigrams). Thus the Q1 Romeo sequence "marde/maried" can be defended. White suggests that possibly the Q2 compositor was misled by the occurrence of the word "made" at the end of the previous line. But the jingle "marred/made" is also common: it occurs, for example, in Romeo Q2 II iv 101-2. And there is good reason for adopting "made" in the line under discussion. Paris has just said that "Younger than she, are happie mothers made", and Capulet pounces on this -- "And too soon mard are those so early made" (i.e. those who are made mothers at such an early age). The repartee has much more snap in Q2 than in the reported text: and it is easy to suppose that the reporter himself substituted another common jingle for that which Shakespeare had written.

- 160 Q1 "youngmen" Q2 "young men". In his revised edition of Q2 Daniel printed this as in Q1, understanding the word in the sense of "yeomen" (which Johnson actually proposed as an emendation).
- 162 Q1 "lumping" Q2 "limping". In his revised edition of Q2 (p.101) Daniel adopts the Q1 reading "as conveying a more picturesque notion of dull, heavy, boorish winter".
- 163 Q1 "female buds" Q2 "fennell buds". The Q1 reading is clearly correct; "fennell" is a misreading of "female" as written by someone careless about his minims. This small Q2 corruption is of some importance: see the second section of the Introduction.
- 166-7 Cf. Q2 lines 32-3. Both texts present difficulties here. As regards the variation Q1 "Such amongst view" Q2 "Which one (i.e. 'on') more view,": "amongst" is a most awkward word to stand in direct relation to "view", and it seems to me very probable that the reporter was recollecting what he had written very shortly before, viz. "amongst fresh female buds" (Q1 line 163).
- 169 Q1 "Through faire Verona streets" Q2 "Through faire Verona": Q1 here anticipates III i 84 (not in Q1) -- "the Prince

expressly hath / Forbid this bandying in Verona streetes".

Q1 "and seeke them out" Q2 "find those persons out". The same variation occurs at Q1 line 1974 Q2 V ii 5 -- Q1 "Going to seeke a barefoote Brother out" Q2 "Going to find a barefoote brother out". The only place where the phrase "to seek out" occurs in the authentic text is IV iii 55-6 -- "I see my Cozins Ghost,/Seeking out Romeo" (Q1 1799 "Seeking for Romeo"): but no connection is suggested. The variation Q1 "seeke out" Q2 "find out" is repeated here at Q1 172 Q2 line 38.

172-7 Chambers includes this passage in the list of places where "points are lost through alterations of order" (William Shakespeare, vol. 1, p.341): the idea of the shoemaker meddling with his yard etc. refers, not to the Servant's going to the learned (as apparently in Q1) but to his being asked to find out "whose names are written here" -- for he cannot read.

172-3 Q1 "whose names are written here, and yet..." Q2 "whose names are written. Here it is written....". While adopting the Q2 text, we must emend the punctuation in accordance with Q1 -- "whose names are written here! It is written....".

180 Q1 "backward" Q2 "giddie". Q1 anticipates the word "backward" from the second half of the line. Possibly the compositor's eye is to blame; but the reporter's memory may have been at fault.

185 Cf. Q2 line 51. Q1's omission of "I pray thee" destroys the metre.

91 ff. From this point up to line 268 ("...a leauen yeare:") Q1 served as the 'copy' for Q2. See the second section of the Introduction.

### Act I Scene iii.

A full analysis of this scene (Q1 lines 236-300) appears in the second section of the Introduction.



Act I Scene iv.

- 307-8 These two lines are omitted by Q2. White considered that they were excised by Shakespeare in revision: (see Furness, p. 54). Ridley (New Temple ed. p. 138) writes: "The fact that these lines occur in Q1 and not in either Q2 or F.... suggests a MS. behind Q1 and not merely a reporter's notes, since the lines do not read like a gag, and must have come from somewhere". But surely it is quite reasonable to suppose that the Q2 omission is merely the result of carelessness on the part of transcriber or compositor, that the lines stood in the prompt-book, that they were spoken on the stage, and that the Q1 reporter remembered them.
- 311 Q1 "A torch for me" Q2 "Giue me a torch". Cf. the variation between the two Qq. at Q1 line 320, Q2 I iv 33 -- Q1 "Giue me a Torch" Q2 "A torch for me". The reporter has thoroughly confused the two passages and an interchange has resulted. A similar interchange will be found in the note on Q1 line 558.
- 313 Q1 "Beleeue me Romeo" Q2 "Nay getle Romeo". Q1 anticipates the next line -- "Not I beleue me you haue dancing shooes".
- 316 Q1 "I cannot stirre" Q2 "I cannot moue". The verb "stir" occurs in Q2 at I i 8 (Q1 line 9) and II i 16 (not in Q1), in both places in conjunction with the word "move", and also at I i 87 (Q2 only). The reporter may have had any of these in mind.
- 324 Q1 "done" is correct, fitting in to a pun. Q2's "dum" is probably a simple misprint of "dun".
- 326-7 Q1 "the mire/Of this surreuerence loue" Q2 "the mire/Or saue you reuerence loue". The Ff. have "saue your reuerence". Editors frequently base their text upon Q1 here (e.g. Dyce, Knight, Singer, White, the old Cambridge editors, Ridley). I agree that "Of" is a much better reading than "Or"; but I do not think we need any further help from Q1, and I would read "the mire / Of save-your-reverence love....". "Surreuerence" (sir-reverence, etc.) is, of course, a contraction of "save your reverence".
- 328 The reporter's memory has apparently failed here, and he has filled the gap with a conventional phrase -- "Leaue this talke". But he has left the line unmetrical.
- 330 Q1 "We burne our lights by night, like Lampes by day"  
Q2 "We waste our lights in vaine, lights lights by day".  
Obviously there is something wrong with the second half of



the Q2 line. The simplest emendation was suggested by Brinsley Nicholson, approved by Daniel in his revised ed. of Q2, and adopted by Dowden (see Arden ed. p. 34): "light lights by day". But the constant recurrence of "light(s)" is ugly, and I agree with Dr Greg who says "the resultant line is one I should be loath to foist on Shakespeare" (Aspects, pp. 179-80). Johnson's emendation also had the merit of simplicity -- "like lights by day": but again the double occurrence of "lights" makes the line dull and flat. Capell conflated Qq. 1 and 2, reading "We waste our lights in vain, like lamps by day"; and this has found general acceptance. Greg suggests "We waste our lights in vain, light lamps by day": he says "This, I think, accounts better for the readings in the second half of the line. That of Q1 (dependent on performance) would be an easy mishearing; while, as regards Q2, I do not see how 'lamps' came to be corrupted to 'lights' except through repetition of a preceding 'light' or 'lights'". In the first half of the Q1 line "burne" is a recollection of that word in Q2 line 41 (Q1 328). And "by night" is probably the filling up of a gap in the memory which remembered "by day" in the second half of the line and balanced it with its exact opposite: an identical case is found in Q1 line 272 (cf. Q2 I iii 34), where Q2 reads "doest thou fall upon thy face? thou wilt fall backward..." and Q1 "Dost thou fall forward, Iuliet? thou wilt fall backward...".

331-2 Q1 "Take our good meaning for our iudgement sits / Three times a day, ere once in her right wits" Q2 "Take our good meaning, for our indgement (sic) sits, / Fiue times in that, ere once in our fine (sic) wits" (Two turned letters in Q2). Q1 entirely misses the point of the second line. "Right wits" may be the result of a confusion with Henry V IV vii 49 ff., where "judgement" and "right wits" are juxtaposed: "as Alexander kild his friend Clytus, being in his Ales and Cuppes; so also Harry Monmouth being in his right wittes, and his good judgements, turn'd away the fat Knight...". With "good judgements" compare "take our good meaning, for our judgement sits...."; confusion would be quite possible. Missing the point of the numeral five in this line, the reporter has apparently forgotten the beginning and filled the gap as best he could with "three times a day". But his line has absolutely no meaning.

341 seq. Q2 omits 341, which must be supplied from Q1. Q1 omits the speech-heading ("Mer.") which should stand in front of 342. Q2 prints the speech as prose, apart from the last three lines, which begin a new page (sig. C2 v). The suggestion that this is due to revision in the author's manuscript is supported by a point first made by W. N. Lettsom in a note in Dyce's 2nd edition (1865) and quoted with approval by Daniel (revised

edition of Q2 p. 105) and Pollard and Dover Wilson (T.L.S. 1919, Aug. 14). Q2 lines 64-5 ("Her Charriot....Coatch-makers:") are absent from Q1: further, the mention of the chariot itself occurs after the individual parts have been described. Lettsom considered this order "preposterous", and suggested misplacement. The lines in question should, he thought, occur immediately after the words "as they lie asleep" (Q2 line 58). Pollard and Wilson point out in addition that in the lines regarded as misplaced the vehicle is called a "chariot", whereas in the description of the separate parts it is a "waggon". Daniel suggested that the misplaced lines were added, during revision, in the margin of the 'copy' for Q2 and misplaced by the printer. Pollard and Wilson agree, postulating revision in the author's manuscript, which they regard as having been the 'copy' for Q2. If the speech had been much revised in that manuscript, the compositor might fail to appreciate the verse-lining and simply set it up straight on as prose. It should be pointed out, however, that even if conditions in the Q2 version of the speech suggest a Shakespearian revision, the 'copy' for Q2 may yet have been a transcription; it is quite possible that the transcriber mistook the position of the (? added) lines about the chariot, and also, seeing before him a very tangled piece of writing, simply copied the bulk of the speech as prose.

In the New Temple edition (1935) Ridley bases his text of this speech mainly on Q1 (see his note, pp. 139-40). It is true that at one point Q1 gives a much more appropriate image than Q2: lines 60-1 of the latter read "her traces of the smallest spider web, her collors of the moonshines watry beams,". The steeds are the smallest of creatures, "little atomies"; how can one imagine moonbeams round their necks? In Q1, on the other hand, the moonbeams form the traces -- a much more likely conception: (Q1 349). But we cannot, as Ridley does, simply adopt the Q1 text, ignoring that of the 'good' Quarto: for one thing, as Ridley himself notes, Q1 omits the whip "which it is as well to have since the lash is to be attached to it". I believe that we must emend Q2, having discovered the reason for what I regard as a corruption in it. I can only suggest that two lines have in some way got crossed. I believe that the correct reading is as follows:

Her traces of the moonshine's watery beams,  
Her collars of the smallest spider web,  
Her whip of cricket's bone, the lash of film, etc.

We can quite easily imagine a tiny piece of the slenderest spider-web wound round the neck of each of Mab's minute steeds. I assume that the Q1 reporter managed to reproduce the first of these lines fairly accurately (349); but he ran the other

two together, producing the line "The collers crickets bones, the lash of filmes," (350). He remembered, however, that the word "web" occurred in the speech, and substituted it (in the plural) for "legs" (Q2 line 59, Q1 347). It will be noticed that the words "of the" occur in the middle of both the first and second lines of the above emended version. A transcriber with that version before him might easily muddle the two lines, transposing the two latter halves, if he were working hastily or if his 'copy' were untidy (as we have seen good reason to suppose it was). In order to make this hypothesis possible we have to assume that the two "of the's" occurred approximately one underneath the other, i.e. that the lineation in the transcriber's 'copy' was verse. But this does not conflict with Pollard and Wilson's hypothesis: the author's MS. originally had the speech in verse-lining; numerous alterations, additions, etc., made it appear so tangled that it was copied as prose; but the one "of the" doubtless stood above the other. In the last resort it does not matter whether we blame the transcriber or the compositor; the confusion may have arisen when the transcriber was copying the original MS. or when the compositor was setting up type from a (confused) transcription. Pollard and Wilson believe that the 'copy' for Q2 was the autograph; if so, the compositor must be blamed for the crossing of the lines. But I have made clear in my Introduction to Romeo my reasons for supposing with Greg that the 'copy' for Q2 was a transcription.

Another case of the crossing of lines in Q2 is to be found at II ii 41-4: Q2 reads as follows --

Whats Mountague? it is nor hand nor foote.  
Nor arme nor face, o be some other name  
Belonging to a man.

Whats in a name that which we call a rose, etc.  
The corresponding passage in Q1 (lines 594-6) runs thus:

Whats Mountague? It is nor hand nor foote,  
Nor arme, nor face, nor any other part.

Whats in a name? That which we call a Rose, etc.

Clearly there is something wrong with the Q2 version. Malone conflated, producing the following, which is generally accepted as the correct reading:

What's Montague? it is nor hand, nor foot,  
Nor arm, nor face, nor any other part  
Belonging to a man. O be some other name!--

What's in a name? that which we call a rose etc.

We can make the simple assumption that the Q1 reporter (or compositor) omitted a single line ("Belonging....other name"). As regards Q2, the transcriber (or possibly the compositor) copied (or set up) "Nor arme nor face" and then took the second half of the next line -- "o be some other name". Then he took the first part of this next line -- "Belonging to a man"; but finding this followed by the words he had taken as



the latter half of the preceding line, he simply left "Belonging to a man" as an unfinished half-line. Or possibly the manuscript before him was so carelessly written at this point that the two lines actually appeared crossed: then he would find himself with a line which seemed to run "Belonging to a man nor any other part". Appreciating that this is nonsense, he may just have ignored the last four words.

No authentic manuscript underlies the Q1 version of the "Queen Mab" speech, despite the fact that its metre and verse-lining are perfect apart from line 373. At two places the point is completely missed. The part of the anatomy over which Mab gallops is always in the authentic version related to the dream induced. But in Q1 (line 360) she gallops over a lawyer's lap and he drams of smelling out a suit; and in line 365 she gallops over a soldier's nose (instead of 'neck') and he dreams of cutting throats. And the structure of the Q1 speech breaks down badly at the end. Yet there is at least one point where Q1 corrects Q2, viz. Q1 line 353 "maide" Q2 line 64 "man" (F2 conjectures the correction "woman"): Q1 also corrects the Q2 "Elklocks", reading "Elfelocks" (line 374).

Of particular interest are three points where Q1 has a more recondite word than Q2, viz. Q1 line 344 "Burgomaster" Q2 "Alderman", Q1 346 "Athwart" Q2 "ouer", Q1 367 "countermines" Q2 "spanish blades". I think "athwart" decidedly better than "ouer": the transcriber responsible for the Q2 'copy' (or, on the Pollard-Wilson theory, the compositor) had before him a MS. which was at this point tangled by revision; if "athwart" were illegible, "ouer" would be the simplest word that could be supplied to fill the gap. I am not going to argue similarly as regards the other two variants mentioned; but it is certainly noticeable that "countermines" fits in much better with "breaches" and "ambuscados" than "spanish blades" do: in Q1 three operations of war occur together, in Q2 two operations of war followed by a type of weapon. But I suppose it enough to fill up gaps in his memory with words exceedingly appropriate to the context.

Act I Scene v.

A complete episode (Q2 lines 1-13) is absent from Q1. There is no evidence as to whether this is due to defective memorial transmission, to deliberate abridgement in an acting version, or to addition in a revision subsequent to the version of the play which underlies Q1.

395-400 Q1 is for the most part metrically perfect here, but owing to the repetition of "Welcome Gentlemen" in line 395 each following line is composed of half of two separate lines in Q2.

397 Q1 "Will haue about with you" Q2 "will walke about with you". The later Qq. and the Ff. (and Rowe) agree with Q2. Pope read "we'll have a bout with you", followed by the editors up to and including Johnson. Capell read "will have a bout with you", which all subsequent editors follow excepting only Daniel, who (in his revised ed. of Q2 p.106) argues for "will walke a bout with you". Daniel writes: "To tread a measure or to walk a measure is a common form of expression among our old dramatists, and in this case where the bout is a bout of dancing the walk of Qq. and Ff. seems to me a preferable reading to the have of the imperfect Q1....For a confirmation of the text of Qq. Ff. I refer to the masking scene in Much Ado About Nothing II i line 75, where Don Pedro choosing Hero as his partner for the dance addresses her:- "Lady, will you walke about with your friend." Hero's reply and other passages in the play show that this was an invitation to dance". Daniel also refers to Florio, New World of Words, ed. 1611: "Girauolta, as Girata. Also a walking turne, as we say a bout". Of the Much Ado reference Dowden says that "we cannot be sure that walk about....refers to the dance" (Arden ed. Romeo, p. 40).

Q1 "ah ha my Mistresses" Q2 "Ah my mistresses" F2-4 "Ah me, mistresses". Rowe, followed by all editors up to Johnson, emended F4 to "Ah me, my mistresses". Capell adopted the Q1 version, and is followed by all editors.

405 Q1 "our standing dayes" Q2 "our dauncing dayes". The reporter, having in the previous line written "Nay sit, nay sit" balances it here with its exact opposite. For other instances of this see the note on Q1 line 330.

415 Q1 has a line peculiar to itself -- "Good youths I faith. Oh youth's a iolly thing". Keightley printed it in his text, and Daniel followed: Ridley prints it in square



brackets denoting provenance from Q1. Otherwise no editor adopts it: but Steevens called it "natural and worth preserving" (Furness p.73), and Dowden refers to it as "a pleasing line" (Arden ed. p.41). It is not impossible that it has been accidentally omitted from Q2 by transcriber or compositor.

- 419 Q1 agrees with Q2, the later Qq., and F1 in reading "It seemes she hangs...."; Ff. 2-4 read "Her beauty hangs....". This latter reading is adopted by the following editors: Rowe, Pope, Theobald, Hanmer, Warburton, Johnson, Capell, Knight, Campbell (1838), Cornwall, Hazlitt, Verplanck, Collier (ed. 2), White, Dyce (ed. 2), Daniel. Knight's comment is extremely uncritical: he points out the beauty of the F2 reading and proceeds "Here, it appears to us, is a higher law to be observed than that of adherence to the ancient copies" (Furness, p.74). Internal evidence has been brought forward in favour of the F2 version (see Steevens, White, in Furness pp. 74-5): Daniel writes (revised ed. of Q2, pp. 106-7) "The internal evidence is strongly in favour of the reading (of F2); "beauty" in the second clause of the sentence (Q2 line 47, Q1 421) being dependent on its occurrence in the first. It is noticeable that the last three folios, in which this emendation occurs, restore in line (46) "Like" of Q1, which, in the greater part of this scene must have presented a fairly accurate copy of the original play" (revised ed of Q2). Dowden comments: "Daniel thinks that Beauty in line (47 Q2) requires beauty here. But how came all the early editions, including Q1, to read It seems? If Her Beauty be an improvement, it may be the improvement of a stage Romeo, and not Shakespeare's" (Arden ed. p. 42). Verplanck thought that possibly the F2 emendation was "a correction of the poet's own, obtained from some other MS., altered during the poet's life" (Furness, p. 74). But such provenance has never been proved for the alterations in the later folios.
- 420 Q1 "Like" Q2 "As". See Daniel, quoted in the previous note. Possibly the Q2 compositor's eye here caught the initial "As" of line 49. Only Knight and Staunton read "As" here.
- 422 Q1 "So shines a snow-white Swan" Q2 "So showes a snowie Doue". There is a double recollection in the Q1 version here: cf. (1) I ii 84-5 (Q1 220-1) "Compare her face with some that I shall show,/And I will make thee think thy swan a crow"; (2) *ibid* 95-6 (Q1 231-2) "some other maide:/That I will shew you shining at this feast".
- 445 Q1 "Therefore be quiet" Q2 "Therefore be patient". Q1 anticipates Q2 line 90 (Q1 458) -- "Be quiet".

- 446 Q1 "Beare a faire presence" Q2 "Shew a faire presence".  
The Q1 variation is the result of a recollection of Q2  
line 68 (Q1 440) -- "A (Q1 he) beares him like a portly  
Gentleman".
- 451 Q1 "the Master of the house" Q2 "the master here". Pro-  
bably the reporter has anticipated I v 118 (Q1 486), where  
the Nurse refers to Lady Capulet as "the Lady of the house".
- 459 Q1 "More light Ye knaue" Q2 "more light, more light for  
shame". Q1 contains here a recollection of Q2 line 25 of  
this scene (Q1 401) -- "More light (Q1 lights) you knaues".  
"Knaue" in Q1 line 456 (Q2 "boy") may be due to an antici-  
pation of this confusion.
- 461 Q1 "greetings" Q2 "greeting". The rhyme-scheme shows the  
Q1 plural to be corrupt.
- 466 The Q1 version is probably correct; Q2 has an intrusive  
"did" which renders the line unmetrical.
- 467 Q1 "gentle kisse" Q2 "tender kis". The Q1 variation is  
probably the result of a recollection of Q2 line 97 (Q1  
465) -- "the gentle sin is this".
- 470 Q1 "which holy Palmers touch" Q2 "that Pilgrims hands do  
tuch". Q1 anticipates the next line -- "...holy Palmers  
kis".
- 474 Q1 "faire saint" Q2 "deare Saint". Cf. Q1 line 615 where  
Q1 again has "faire Saint", corresponding to Q2 II ii 63  
"faire maide".
- 475 Q1 "yeeld thou" Q2 "(grant thou)". Q1 may contain here an  
anticipation of II ii 107 (Q1 659) where Juliet speaks of  
her "yeelding" to Romeo.
- 484 ff. For the typography of the Nurse's part from here to the  
end of the scene see the second section of the Introduction.
- 484 Q1 "Madame your mother calles" Q2 "Madam your mother craues  
a word with you". Q1 contains here a recollection of I iii  
5-6 -- "Juliet. How now who calls?/Nur. Your mother", (Q1  
lines 241-2). Cf. also Q2 III v 67, where Juliet says "Who  
ist that calls? It is my Lady mother", at which point Q1  
repeats material from the beginning of I iii (see Q1 lines  
1497-8).
- 487 Note that Q1 repeats "and a" a third time (Q2 "and").
- 490 Q1 "a Mountague" is a slip for "a Capulet".

- 491 Q1 "thrall" Q2 "debt". The old Cambridge editors write (ed. Romeo, note II): "The first Quarto here has 'thrall', the others 'debt', which though it makes a rhyme does not improve the sense. The next two lines are not in the first Quarto. As, unlike the immediate context, they also rhyme, while they are not particularly forcible, we incline to think that some other hand than Shakespeare's inserted them".
- 496-8 "I promise you....to my chamber hoe": the reporter has anticipated Q2 III iv 6-7, 34.
- 502 Q1 "That as I thinke is yong Petruchio" Q2 "Marrie that I thinke be young Petruchio". Apparently the reporter's memory of the Q2 line was vague: he has constructed a material line, but it is flat and, compared with that of Q2, less characteristic of the Nurse's manner of speech.
- 516 Q1 "Come your mother staies for you, Ile goe a long with you" Q2 "Come lets away, the strangers all are gone". Q1 may contain a double recollection here: cf. (1) Q2 I iii 91 (not in Q1) -- "Mo. We follow thee, Iuliet the Countie staies" (2) Q2 I i 193 "Ben. Soft I will go along" Q1 line 121 "Nay Ile goe along".

Act II Scene i.

518 Q1 "Shall I goe forward" Q2 "Can I go forward". Probably Q1 anticipates the construction of II ii 38 (Q1 592) where Romeo similarly addresses a question to himself -- "Shall I heare more, or shall I speake at (Q1 to) this?"

521 "Doest thou heare": there is no reason to suppose with Hubbard (Wisconsin Univ. Studies, 19, p.6) that these words may belong to the preceding speech of Benvolio. Mercutio shouts "Doest thou heare?" at the invisible Romeo, and, receiving no answer, turns to Benvolio with "He is wise etc." "Doest thou heare?" is not found in Q2; the reporter may have had at the back of his mind Benvolio's warning at Q2 line 23 -- "And if he heare thee thou wilt anger him" (cf. Q1 line 537).

525 Q1's repeated "Call" is probably an actor's extempore ejaculation.  
In Q2 "Nay Ile coniure too" appears erroneously as the last line of Benvolio's speech. This, and the fact that it is one of two very short lines occurring together (lines 6-7: i.e. one metrical unit split into two parts) suggests that not inconceivably these had been accidentally omitted in the 'copy', if that was a transcript, and had been added in the margin.

526-36 Q1 prints verse as prose in these speeches of Mercutio.  
538-43 This is in contrast with Mercutio's final speech in this scene (Q1 547-57) which Q1 prints correctly as verse.

526 Q1 "liuer" Q2 "louer". The Q2 reading is generally adopted by editors. But "there seems to be a good deal to be said for the reading 'liuer', this being of course the seat of the disease of love" (W. W. Greg, Aspects, p.147). Greg points out that the transcriber responsible for the 'copy' for Q2 was having a good deal of difficulty in this scene; witness corruptions due to the misreading of illegible handwriting (see Q2 line 11) and one place (Q2 line 14) where Q1 has been consulted.

528 Q1 "Pronounce but Loue and Doue" Q2 line 11 "prouaunt, but loue and day". Q1 is correct: "'prouaunt' and 'day' are certainly graphic errors" (Greg). See previous note.

530 Q1 "sonne and heire" is correct. Q2's "sonne and her" may be simply a misreading or misprint. It is impossible to tell whether the personal pronoun was intended. At any rate the Q1 reading is clearly correct.



Both Qq. have "young Abraham:Cupid", which is clearly corrupt (see Q2 line 14). Q2 must have copied this from Q1 (see Greg, Aspects, p.147). But the evidence of Q2 line 11 of this scene (see note on Q1 528) shows that the Q2 compositor was using MS. 'copy'. So Dr Greg suggests that the transcriber responsible for the 'copy' for Q2 found the playhouse MS. difficult at this point and turned to Q1, taking from it, however, a corrupt reading.

- 531 Q1 "trim" Q2 "true". There is no doubt that Q1 preserves the correct reading: it is supported by the line "The blind-ed boy that shoots so trim" in a ballad on Cophetua and the Beggar-maid, which is clearly alluded to here (as was first pointed out by Pope, who did not however read "trim" in his edition). The ballad is to be found in Percy's Reliques, vol. 1, p.198. See Furness, Variorum, p.89.

Q1 "young King Cophetua" Q2 "King Cophetua". The Q1 error may be blamed on the compositor; his eye may have caught "young Abraham:Cupid" again, or this "young" may have been retained in his memory.

- 532 Q1 "begger wench" Q2 "begger mayd". "We may wonder" says Dr Greg "whether 'begger wench' is not more in accord with Mercutio's humour than the rather conventional 'beggar-maid'" (Aspects, p.147). He points out that "begger mayd", familiar from the ballad, would come more readily to the pen of the transcriber who produced the 'copy' for Q2.

After "begger wench" the metrical structure of the Q1 speech breaks down: the bulk of Q2 lines 16-7 ("he stirreth not.... ..coniure him") is omitted, and Q2 lines 19-20 are defectively reproduced.

- 534 Q1 "prettie foote" Q2 "fine foot". With the Q1 reading cf. Richard III, I i 93 -- "Shore's wife hath a pretty foot". This may not inconceivably have been in the reporter's mind.

- 538 Q1's initial 'Tut' is probably an actor's extempore ejaculation. In Furness's reprint it is misprinted 'But'.

- 538-9 "Tut....Mistris circle": Q1 loses the metrical structure.

- 546 Q1 misprints 'is' as 'in'.

- 547 Q1 "will not" Q2 "cannot". The corruption here in Q1 is probably the result of the compositor's eye having caught "Now will he" in the next line.

- 552 "Et caetera": this is omitted from the corresponding line in Q2 (line 39) and must be supplied from Q1.



- 555-6 Q1 tacks these two lines on to Mercutio's speech; they belong to Benvolio (see Q2 lines 43-4).

Q1 "Come lets away" Q2 "Come shall we go?" With the Q1 version cf. Q2 I v 152, where the Nurse says "Come lets away".

Act II Scene ii.

558 Q1 "forth yonder window" Q2 "through yonder window". The same variation occurs, the other way round, at I i 112 (Q1 line 64):

Q1 .....an houre before the worshipt sunne  
Peept through the golden window of the East...

Q2 .....an houre before the worshipt Sun,  
Peerde forth the golden window of the East....

At neither point is there reason to suspect corruption in Q2. Both passages contain the words "window, east, sun". In the transmission of the Q1 text two very similar passages have been confused, and 'through' and 'forth' interchanged.

561 Q1 "That" Q2 "Who". It is possible that the Q1 reading is the result of the compositor's eye having caught "That" at the beginning of the next line; on the other hand nothing more than coincidence may be involved.

564 Q1 "pale and green" Q2 "sicke and green". The Q2 reading has been defended by certain critics: "To be sick is to be pale in Shakespeare's language; thus 'sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought'" (Singer, Shakespeare Vindicated, 1853, p.231): "The copula here joins what is one substantive idea: green-sickness -- i.e. an ailment of languishing young girls" (Delius). There is, however, much to be said for an alternative view: "The compositor appears to have been confused by a reminiscence of the epithets applied to the moon in the third line above (i.e. II ii 5, Q1 561), and perhaps also by a passing thought of green-sickness which they suggested, and so repeated the first instead of the second of these epithets" (White). In his 2nd edition (1856) Singer also maintained that "'sick' was caught from the line above". For the expression of these views see Furness, Variorum ed., p.94-5. I am in agreement with White's theory, but I would hold a transcriber responsible rather than the compositor: see Introduction, "A Note on the 'Copy' for Q2".

569 Q1 "skies" Q2 "heauen". In his revised edition of Q2 Daniel suggests that the rhyme "skies/eyes" (Q1 569-70) may represent "an accidental rhyme in the original play, corrected in the copy prepared for Q2": it is far more probable that the reporter is responsible for the rhyme; Hoppe (R.E.S. 1938, p.278) finds that the reporter exhibits "a fondness for creating gratuitous rimes" and gives a list.

570 Q1's "doe" corrects the Q2 misprint "to" (line 15).

- 577 With Q1's initial "Oh" cf. Q2 line 23.  
In his revised edition of Q2 Daniel emends Q2 line 22 to  
"See, now she...." (using Q1: cf. Q1 "Oh now she..." Q2  
"See how she...."): this seems unnecessary.
- 578 Q1 "to that same hand" Q2 "vpon that hand". Q1 is almost  
certainly correct here; the Q2 reading is probably a scribal  
or compositorial corruption due to recollection of the pre-  
ceding line ("....she leanes her cheeke vpon her hand") or  
to the eye having caught the end of that line again.
- 579 Q1 "kisse" Q2 "touch". There is no reason to suspect Q2  
here. In Q1 the idea of the glove kissing the cheek may  
be derived from a recollection of the not dissimilar idea  
at I i 228 (Q2 only) -- "These happie maskes that kis faire  
Ladies browes".
- 581-2 The Q1 line-division is that of elocution.
- 586 Q1 "lasie pacing cloudes" Q2 "lazier puffing Cloudes". I  
believe that Q2 is corrupt here, owing to a transcriber's  
association of this passage with I iv 88-95. See Intro-  
duction, "A Note on the 'Copy' for Q2".
- 594-5 Cf. Q2 lines 41-3. This is a difficult passage, where in  
all probability both texts are corrupt. The versions are  
these:-  
Q1 "Whats Mountague? It is nor hand nor foote,/Nor arme,  
nor face, nor any other part".  
Q2 "Whats Mountague? it is nor hand nor foote,/Nor arme  
nor face, o be some other name/Belonging to a man".  
The last line in the Q2 version is metrically incomplete.  
Malone reconstructed what is very probably the Shakespearian  
version:  
"What's Montague? It is nor hand, nor foot,  
Nor arm, nor face, nor any other part  
Belonging to a man. O, be some other name!"  
This involves in the case of Q1 the simple hypothesis of the  
omission of a single line. In the case of Q2 explanation  
of the corruption is more difficult: see Note, Q1 342 ff.
- 597 Q1 "By any other name" Q2 "By any other word". Since Pope  
adopted it, the Q1 reading has won general acceptance  
(though Ulrici and Staunton retained that of Q2). I think  
it very possible that the scribe responsible for the Q2  
'copy' anticipated line 59 of this scene (Q1 611): I quote  
Q2 lines 57-9:  
My name dear saint, is hatefull to my selfe,  
Because it is an enemy to thee,  
Had I it written, I would teare the word.

- 598 In the corresponding line in Q2 (line 46) "were" is misprinted "wene".
- 599 Q1 "the diuine perfection" Q2 "that deare perfection". Possibly Q1 contains a confusion here with Two Gentlemen II vii 13 -- "To one so dear,/Of such diuine perfection".
- 600 Q1 "part thy name" Q2 "doffe thy name". In his revised edition of Q2, Daniel supports the Q1 reading, which provides a play upon words (cf. in the next line "thy (Q1 that) name which is no part of thee"): he quotes a parallel from Sonnet CIII -- "that which governs me to go about / Doth part his function and is partly blind". Ridley also adopts the Q1 reading. But if "doffe" is corrupt it is difficult to see how it came there: there is no graphic similarity with "part" nor can I find any passage which the transcriber might have associated with this one and which contains the word "doffe". On the other hand, it is perfectly easy to suppose that the reporter forgot "doffe", and, anticipating the next line, used the verb "part", consciously creating a play upon words.
- 601 Q1 "that name" Q2 "thy name". It is difficult to choose between these two readings. That of Q1 seems to me the better, that of Q2 containing a repetition from the preceding line ("doffe thy name") for which scribe or compositor may be blamed. On the other hand, a supporter of the Q2 reading would argue that the Q1 reporter allowed "that tytle", also in the preceding line, to influence him to write "that name" in this one.
- 602 Q1 "Take all I haue" Q2 "Take all my selfe". At line 1843 Q1 contains the same phrase as here: "to him (i.e. Death) I giue all that I haue". There too it is peculiar to Q1.
- 613 Q1 "that tongues vtterance" Q2 "thy tongus vttering": Malone adopted the Q1 version here, pointing out that it is closely parallel to a passage in King Edward III (1596) -- "His ear to drink her sweet tongue's utterance" (see Furness, p.99-100). Ridley reads "thy tongue's utterance". It could, however, be argued that the Q1 reporter had this Edward III line in mind, thus corrupting "uttering" to "utterance". "Uttering" has the approval of most editors. Some who read "uttering", however, take "that" from Q1, in place of Q2's "thy", making II ii 60-1 an aside (Pope, Capell, White). It is possible, however, that the reporter wrote "that tongues...." under the influence of "that title", "that name" in Q1 lines 600 and 601.
- 615 Q1 "faire Saint" Q2 "faire maide". The Q1 reading probably contains a recollection of Q2 line 57 (Q1 609) -- "deare



saint". The Q1 reading has been frequently adopted by editors (Pope, Collier, Hudson, Halliwell, Theobald, Capell, Dyce, etc.): but I agree with Ulrici who thought the simple 'maid' more poetic here than "the constant repetition of the same flattery", and with White who noted that 'fair' is a much more suitable epithet for 'maid' than for 'saint' (see Furness, pp. 99-100).

Q1 "displease" Q2 "dislike". There is no reason to adopt the Q1 reading here, as Pope, Collier, Hudson, Halliwell and White did.

619 "kinsmen": Q2 misprints "kismen" (line 67).

623 Q1 "let" Q2 "stop": Capell adopted the Q1 variant; Ridley follows him.

624 Q1 "finde" Q2 "see": also 628 Q1 "they shuld finde thee here" Q2 "they saw thee here". The reporter had in mind Q2 line 67 and/or 78 (Q1 619, 630), where the phrase "finde thee (me) here" occurs.

629 Q1 "thee" is an error for "me": it is probably a careless repetition from the preceding line, and the compositor may be to blame.

Q1 "sight" Q2 "eies": the Q1 reading was adopted by Capell and other editors (see Furness p.101).

634 "By loue": this is also the reading of Q2 (line 82). Keightley emended to "By Love's" (understanding 'direction'), and Daniel follows him in his revision of Q2: they would therefore assume corruption common to the two quartos. But no necessity for emendation is generally felt.

Editorial opinion is divided between "who" (Q1) and "that" (Q2). The Q1 reading is favoured by Capell, Singer, Hudson, Dyce, Cowden Clarke, Keightley; that of Q2 by Daniel, Furness, Dowden, Ridley. There is no reason to suspect Q2.

Note Q2's misprint "promp" in line 82.

635 Q1's initial "I" is an uncorrected false start, due to the compositor's eye having caught the "I" which begins the next line.

Q1 "he gaue me counsaile and I lent him eyes" Q2 "He lent me counsell, and I lent him eyes": probably Q1 contains here an anticipation of IV i 62 (Q1 line 1686), where Juliet says to the Friar "Giue me some present (Q1 sudden) counsell".



- 637 "washt": Q2 misprints this word "washeth" (line 85).
- 638 Q1 "would" is generally preferred to Q2's "should" (line 86).
- 644 Q1 introduces "Nay" (probably an actor's ejaculation) which disturbs the metre.
- 645-7 "but if.....Ioue smiles": the Q1 line-division is that of elocution. The sense of the passage is clearly conveyed. In Q2 on the other hand (lines 93-5) the punctuation ruins the sense; it looks as if a careless attempt had been made to punctuate unpunctuated 'copy', whether by a transcriber or by the compositor.
- Q1 "smiles" Q2 "laughs". It is just possible that the Q1 reporter had at the back of his mind IV i 8 (Q1 1643) where Paris says "For Venus smiles not in a house of teares". That the sense of the verb is different is not necessarily an argument against this explanation of the Q1 variant. The idea of a deity smiling upon lovers might have been further suggested by passages like II vi 1 (Q2 only) "So smile the heauens vpon this holy act" or even IV iii 4 (Q2 only) "I haue need of many orysones/To moue the heauens to smile vpon my state", although again the sense of the verb is different.
- 649 Q1 "too easely wonne" Q2 "too quickly wonne". Possibly Q1 contains here a confusion with Richard III, III vii 50-1: "And be not easily won to our request,/Play the maid's part, say no, but take it".
- 650 Q1 contains an inversion.
- 653 Q1 "hauour" is preferable to Q2's "behauour" (line 101), which is probably a faulty normalisation by scribe or compositor and which disturbs the metre.
- 655 Q1 "more cunning" Q2 "coying". Q2 is certainly corrupt in omitting "more"; by an interesting coincidence the same word is omitted by Q1 in the next line. "Cunning" is generally accepted by editors as the genuine reading: if it were spelt "cunyng", and if the arms of the 'u' were curved inwards and the first 'n' was either accidentally omitted or so crushed as to be imperceptible, the word would appear as "coyng"; a transcriber or compositor might expand this to "coying". The omission of more immediately before this word might corroborate the suggestion of difficult 'copy'. This explanation is probably the true one. On the other hand it should be noticed that there is something to be said in favour of "coying", which was retained by Johnson and Ulrici. "Coying" would be the verbal noun formed from an

intransitive verb "to coy": such a verb did exist -- see the O.E.D. s.v. "coy" vb. (1) 4 (intr.), "to act or behave coyly; to affect shyness or reserve". It is chiefly used in the phrase "to coy it" (examples are quoted from Kyd, Massinger, Dryden, Rowe and Scott) but not invariably so. The first appearance quoted is Stanyhurst's Aeneis, 139 (dated 1583) -- "If she coye, that kendleth thee fondling loouer his onset". Thus it is possible to assume the verbal noun "coying", i.e. "coy behaviour", or, as Ulrici interprets it (Furness p.102), "primness, affected modesty". The idea of coyness is extremely well suited to the passage: a similar idea is, of course, contained in the word "strange", and, if "coying" were accepted, "to be strange" would be regarded as a sort of epexegetical extension. Taking the line as it stands in Q2 as genuine, the passage could be interpreted thus: "I will be more faithful than those maidens who have more affected modesty (i.e. who affect more (calculating) modesty), so that their conduct is prim and cold". That the syntax of the Q2 line is curious is by no means an indication that Shakespeare could not have written it so. F2 emends to "coyning"; this certainly indicates that the person responsible did not understand "coying", but it does not necessarily imply that that reading is corrupt. These are the arguments in favour of each of the two readings. The position is that it is extremely reasonable to suppose that "coying" is corrupt and that "cunning" is one of the Q1 readings which should be admitted as genuine. "Coying" can be defended, but the defence is rather strained.

658 Q1 "true loues Passion" Q2 "truloue passion". I have found no editor who adopts the Q2 reading here. (Note that the Folios and Q5 read "true Loues....").

661 Q1 is corrupt in the omission of the initial vocative "Lady" (cf. Q2 line 109).

Q1 "sweare" Q2 "vow". Pope, Capell, Delius, and Staunton followed Q2 here, but Juliet's interruption "O swear not by the moone" is a strong argument in favour of the Q1 reading, which was first adopted by Malone. Delius argued (Furness p.103) that "the ascent from vow to swear in Juliet's reply seems to have been intended by the poet"; but I can see no particular point in such an "ascent", and the whole emphasis of her reply is on the moon. I suggest that Q2's "vow" is a corruption introduced by the transcriber responsible for the 'copy' for Q2: he was probably anticipating line 131 (Q2) -- "Th'exchange of thy loues faithful vow for mine".

664 Q1 "circled" is correct; Q2 misprints "circle" (line 112).

- 666 Q1 "Now by" Q2 "What shall I sweare by?" Apparently the reporter's memory failed him here and he filled in the gap in his own way. He means to suggest that Juliet interrupted an oath.
- 667 "Nay": probably an actor's ejaculation.
- 668 Q1 "glorious selfe" Q2 "gracious selfe". White adopted the Q1 reading here, but it is corrupt -- it is the result of a recollection of Q2 line 28 of this scene (Q1 582), where Romeo says to Juliet "thou art / As glorious to this night etc.".
- 671 Q1 "my true harts loue" Q2 "my hearts deare loue". Possibly the Q1 reporter has confused this passage with Richard III, II i 10, where Rivers says (in a dissimilar context) "And with my hand I seal my true heart's love". (Note also that at IV i 59 Juliet, speaking to the Friar, refers to her "true heart").
- 672 Q1 "Sweare not at al" Q2 "Well do not sweare". The Q1 version is an inexact recollection of Q2 line 115 of this scene (Q1 667) -- "Do not sweare at all".
- 674 Note the Q1 inversion.
- 676-7 In 676 between the words "lightens" and "I heare" there is a big lacuna, corresponding to Q2 lines 124 ("sweete....") to 139: note how after the gap the Q1 text is hesitant -- the reporter recollects only the first three words of the phrase "I heare some noyse within" and completes it in his own commonplace way, and the rhyming couplet ("adue/true") is disrupted although the rhymes are present.
- 679-80 Q1 "I feare being night,/All this is but a dreame I heare and see" Q2 "I am afeard/Being in night, all this is but a dreame". As Hoppe points out (R.E.S. 1938 p.276) Q1 conflates this Q2 passage with either (i) Two Gentlemen, V iv 26 "How like a dream is this I see and hear!", or (ii) Comedy of Errors, V i 375 "If this be not a dream I see and hear". Daniel (revised ed. of Q2) is aware of these two parallels; yet he considers it probable that the Q2 version is a revision of the "lines of the original play as given in Q1". But surely it is more probable that a memorial reconstructor of the Q2 passage has contaminated it by confusing it with either or both of the other passages.
- 681 Q1 "too flattering true" Q2 "too flattering sweete". Q1 contains here an anticipation of Q2 V i 1, where Romeo talks of "the flattering truth of sleepe" (see note on Q1 line 1908).

- 682 Q1 "good Romeo" Q2 "deare Romeo". The Q1 compositor's eye, running ahead, may have caught the "good" of "good night" (same line); or, carrying the whole line in his head, he may have anticipated that word.
- 688 Q1 "my Lord" is correct: Q2 (line 152) contracts this to "my L.", followed by Q3. Q4 wrongly expands the contraction to "my loue", which reading was accepted by Pope, Theobald, and Warburton. The Folios read "my Lord". Quite obviously the tenour of Q2 lines 151-2 (Q1 687-8) requires "my Lord": Juliet will surrender all her fortunes to Romeo and follow him wherever he goes.
- 692 Q1 "Romeo, Romeo" Q2 "Hist Romeo hist". The Q1 reading is probably a recollection of Q2 line 34 (Q1 588) -- "O Romeo, Romeo, wherefore art thou Romeo?"
- 694 Q1 "may not crie aloud" Q2 "may not speake aloud". Q1 contains here an anticipation of Q2 III i 163-4, where Ben-olio says "Romeo he cries aloud,/Hold friends, friends part" (at that point Q1 is different: see line 1175).
- 696 Q1 "voice" Q2 "tongue". In my view, the Q1 reading is preferable. The tongue cannot be made hoarse. And there is an easy explanation of the Q2 reading: a transcriber, responsible for the 'copy' for Q2, anticipated Q2 line 169 -- "How siluer sweete, sound louers tongues by night,". Note also that Q2 omits the last word of the line ("mine"); this accords with the theory of careless transcription at this point.
- 697 Q1 "my Romeos name" Q2 "my Romeo". The Q2 reading seems to me very attractive. We might well punctuate it thus: "With repetition of 'my Romeo'". Juliet dwells ecstatically on each syllable of the name (and the possessive is also emphatic). The Q1 reading might be an anticipation of the end of the next full line. But Steevens followed Q1 here; and the old Cambridge editors are among those who uphold him.
- 698 The old Cambridge editors adopt this extra-metrical "Romeo" from Q1. It seems to be necessitated by the next line, where Romeo says "It is my soule that calles vpon my name". Unless Q1 698 is incorporated into the text, Juliet has not called upon his name.
- 700 Q1 "louers tongues in night" Q2 "louers tongues by night". Q1 contains a recollection of Q2 lines 143-4, where Romeo says "I am afeard/Being in night, all this is but a dreame". At the corresponding point (line 679) Q1 has "being night".



- 702 Q1 "Madame" Q2 "My Neece". The Q2 reading is an extraordinary corruption. Of that of Q1 Ridley observes (New Temple ed. Romeo, p.141) that it "seems to me just possible as a kind of humorous formality of address". It is just possible, although such a tone seems discordant in the context. Q4 emends to "My Deere", F2 to "My sweete". Malone rightly emphasised the arbitrary nature of the F2 alterations (see Furness, p.108), and adopted the Q1 reading. Certainly the emendations of Q4 and F2 have no authority; but it remains possible that occasionally an emendation in a late edition may be a good one. If "Madame" is correct, how did the error "My neece" arise? Hardly from a misreading of the former word badly written! On the other hand, it is quite possible that "Deere", if very badly written, might have been misread "Neece".
- It seems to me highly probable that Q1's "Madame" is the result of a stray recollection of the Nurse's call "Madam" in Q2 lines 152 and 154. At both points it is absent from Q1, which omits the whole business of the Nurse's interruptions and Juliet's replies to her (Q2 lines 141, 152, 153, 154). If this explanation of the Q1 "Madame" were accepted, it would accord with Hoppe's theory of a double play underlying Q1 -- the reporter had acted in a shortened version, but had some knowledge of passages in the full version which had been omitted in the abbreviated one (see R.E.S. 1938 pp.271 ff.). Knight suggested that "Neece" was a misreading of a speech-heading "Nurce" and that the Nurse was intended to interrupt a third time with a "Madam" which was either accidentally omitted or implied in the speech-heading. But one glance at his text is enough to dispose of his theory:

Jul. Romeo!

Ro. My --

Nur. Madam.

Jul. What o'clock tomorrow etc.

He went so far as to argue that the omission of "At" before "what a clocke" in Q2 line 173 (present in Q1, line 703) indicates that "a word of two syllables was wanted after 'my' when 'at' was rejected"! (Furness, p.108). But this omission of "At" is doubtless accidental.

- 707 Note Q1's threefold repetition of "stay" (707, 708, 710), corresponding to Q2's "stand" (178), "stand" (179), "stay" (181). Cf. note on Q1 line 65.
- 714 Q1 "her hand" Q2 "his hand". Q1 is right here. As regards "his", it is possible that the transcriber's or compositor's eye caught "his" in the next line.
- 716 Q1 "silke" is correct, Q2's "silken" unmetrical. Possibly there was an accidental mark above the final 'e' in the 'copy' and the compositor of Q2 inferred an abbreviation for final "-en".



- 723 This line, correctly assigned here, is given in Q2 to Juliet (Q2 line 195). (The result is two successive assignations to Juliet -- at lines 190 and 195). Possibly the transcriber responsible for the Q2 'copy' accidentally omitted our line; checking his work, he inserted the missing line; but, seeing "Ro." at the beginning of Q2 196, he unthinkingly put "Iu." in front of the inserted line.
- 725 Q1 "my Ghostly fathers Cell" Q2 "my ghostly Friers close cell". Q1 is right; "ghostly friar" is nonsensically tautologous. The transcriber behind Q2 may well have had at the back of his mind V iii 263 (Q2) -- "Meaning to keepe her closely at my Cell". The MS. he was copying may have been difficult to read at this point, or he himself may merely have been careless. At all events he seems to have contaminated the text by an anticipation.
- 726 Q1 "good hap" Q2 "deare hap". Probably Q1 anticipates III iii 177 -- "And he shall signifie from time to time,/ Euery good hap to you, that chaunces here" (cf. Q1 lines 1404-5).

Act II Scene iii.

726 S.D. Q1 has "Enter Frier Francis". But the Friar's name is Laurence. That "Francis" is just a slip is shown by the occurrence of the name "Laurence" throughout the Q1 text: see lines 968, 1012, <sup>1261</sup>1625, 1738, 1748, 1971. Friar Laurence is a Franciscan (see Q2 V ii 1); and twice he swears by St. Francis (II iii 66, Q1 785; V iii 125 -- Q2 only). This may explain the slip. Furthermore, there is a Friar Francis in Much Ado (see IV i 1), with whom there may be a momentary confusion.

727-30 In Q2 these four lines appear twice, with variations; they are erroneously inserted at II ii 197-200, in the middle of a speech by Romeo, and correctly at II iii 1-4, spoken by the Friar. The variations between the two Q2 versions are these: II ii 198 Checkring, iii 2 Checking; II ii 199 darknesse fleckted, iii 3 fleckeld darknesse; II ii 200 daies pathway, made by Tytans wheelles, iii 4 daies path, and Titans burning wheelles. The corresponding Q1 readings are: Checkring (728), flecked darkens (729), daies path, and Titans fierie wheelles (730). "Checkring" is in all probability correct, "checking" being possibly a simple error in transcription or type-setting; "burning wheelles" is certainly a corruption, the result of anticipation of "burning" in the next line (Q2 II iii 5, Q1 731). "Flecked darkness" is read by all editors after Capell, who read "flecker'd darkness"; Pope, Theobald, Hanmer, Warburton, Johnson read "darkness flecker'd". "Flecked" may be correct, although, as Dowden points out (Arden ed. p. 63), the diminutive verb "fleckle" is possible, implying little streaks or spots. Daniel (parallel text ed., intro., p. vii) and Dover Wilson and Pollard (T.L.S., 1919, Aug. 14) find in the Q2 duplication evidence of Shakespearian revision. They hold that II ii 197-200 was inserted, during revision, in the margin; the original which it was intended to supplant was not struck through (i.e. II iii 1-4); and the position which the new material was to occupy was not indicated. Thus the Q2 compositor misplaced the addition, and proceeded to set up the uncanceled original version as it stood. Dover Wilson and Pollard refuse to regard the duplication as attributable to a transcriber; no scribe, they say, could be so extraordinarily careless. Chambers disagrees (William Shakespeare, Vol. I, p. 344): "...the first version was not necessarily more than a false start by Shakespeare, such as we find in Love's Labour's Lost, left undeleted or inadequately deleted. It would not take a particularly 'slavish' transcriber to copy it as it stood". Furthermore, the theory that the 'copy' for Q2 was a transcription is practically necessary to account for II ii 201 (see note on Q1 line 725). But the initial cause of the Q2 duplication must be sought in the author's manuscript. Now,

if II ii 197-200 was a Shakespearian 'second thought', intended to supplant II iii 1-4, how much of the latter did Shakespeare want to alter? Very little. "Checking" (iii 2) may be a scribal or compositorial error: we need not suppose that it was the original Shakespearian reading, altered to "checkring", for Q1 727-30 clearly represents the lines as found in Q2 II iii 1-4, and that text reads "Checkring" (728). "Fleckted" is certainly an error (II ii 199), while "fleckeld" is at least possible; the former is therefore not an alteration to replace the latter. The alteration of the order of "fleckted/fleckeld" and "darknesse" may also be a vagary of a transcriber or compositor; but even if Shakespeare was responsible, he could easily have indicated the change without rewriting the whole line. Here is the great difficulty I find about supposing that Shakespeare himself wrote the four lines twice; the only alteration which we might attribute to revision is that of the latter part of the fourth line: why then should he go to the trouble of rewriting also the preceding three? I would not say that he did not do so; but it seems a little odd.

It appears to me possible that in the manuscript which the transcriber responsible for the Q2 'copy' had before him the four lines were written only once, up and down the margin. They may have been an addition, or they may replace a different opening of II iii which was cancelled. Written in a confined space they were probably difficult to read. In particular, the fourth line might be very difficult to read, being crushed against the horizontal lines of the rest of the text. I suggest that in this last line the only words which the transcriber could read clearly were "From forth daies path....Titans....wheelles". The words "and" and "fierie" were indecipherable. The position these four lines were to occupy was inadequately indicated: the ends of the lines, which were written vertically, may have reached to opposite II ii 196. The transcriber proceeded to insert them immediately after that line. He copied the first two lines correctly; in the third line he altered the order of "darknesse" and "fleckeld" (which he read "fleckted": it may have been spelled "fleckled" in the manuscript); this alteration of order was probably mere carelessness. Then he came to the fourth line. Two words were quite illegible; faced with "path.....Titans....wheelles" he probably solved his problem by botching up a half-line of his own -- "pathway, made by Tytans wheelles". I do not think it absurd to make this assumption, because in the very next line he seems to have done the same thing: "my ghostly Friars close cell" is unquestionably incorrect; as we have seen in the last note Dr Greg considers that it can only have arisen through "inability to decipher the playhouse manuscript" (Aspects, p. 146). Presumably the manuscript he was copying contained the words "ghostly fathers cell"; "fathers" being quite illegible, the

transcriber filled up the gap by his own resources. To return to the present problem: having inserted these four lines, the transcriber proceeded to copy II ii 201-2. Then he came to the beginning of II iii. Here possibly he noticed an indistinct indication that the marginal passage was to be inserted here. So he put it in again; doubtless he meant to go back and score out the four lines which he had inserted erroneously, but apparently he forgot. In copying the four marginal lines again, of course, he was faced with the same problems as before. This time he misread "checking" as "checking"; but he got the relative positions of "darknesse" and "fleckled" correct, and managed to copy "fleckled" correctly (spelling it "fleckeld"). But what of the last line with its two undecipherable blotches? I suggest that this time he was a little more careful. He may even have consulted someone else who knew this part of the play better than he himself. Weighing carefully this time the fact that one of the blotches occurred between the words "Tytans" and "wheeles", and perhaps remembering now that an adjective stood between, but forgetting the exact word, he may simply have appropriated "burning" from the next line; thus he produced "path, and Titans burning wheeles". This was still corrupt, but nearer the truth than his first attempt, which he accidentally left uncanceled. Thus the Q2 compositor set up both passages.

Most editors agree that Q1 (lines 727-30) preserves the correct version; the reporter's memory was good here. I would just say that perhaps "fleckled" should be adopted; but "flecked" may have stood in the manuscript which the transcriber was copying, and by pure carelessness it may have been written in such a way that it appeared that a long letter, interpreted first as 't' then as 'l', stood after the 'k'. Finally I would stress the tentative character of this suggested explanation; the explanation of Daniel, Dover Wilson, and Pollard is certainly much simpler.

732 Q1's "darke" is probably a printer's error for "danke" (cf. Q2 line 6 "dancke").

736 Note Q1's inversion.

740 Q1 "Reuolts to vice" Q2 "Reuolts from true birth". Q1 anticipates the next line -- "Vertue it selfe turnes vice being misapplied".

742 Q1 "And vice sometimes by action dignified" Q2 "And vice, sometime by action dignified". It seems that a verb is required here. If "sometimes" is a simple adverb, we must posit a corruption common to both quartos -- possibly the omission of a "'s" after "action" (Theobald, Hanmer, Warburton, Johnson). On the other hand Capell suggested "sometime's", in which case only Q2 omits the verb.



- 577
- 745 Q1 "ech hart" Q2 "each part". Q1 anticipates the last word of the next line.
- 750 Q1 gives no entry-direction for Romeo.
- 751 Q1 "Good morrow to my Ghostly Confessor" Q2 "Goodmorrow father". Q1 anticipates Q2 II vi 21 -- "Good euen to my ghostly confessor".
- 752 Q1 "so soone" Q2 "so sweete": probably Q1 anticipates "So soone" at the beginning of the next line but one.
- 779 Q1 "hers likewise on mine" Q2 "hers is set on mine". Q1 probably contains a recollection of "likewise" in Q2 line 55 (Q1 774).
- 781 Note Q1's inversion.
- 802 This line begins sheet E in Q1: the fount of type changes (a smaller type is used), and the running-title is altered from "The most excellent Tragedie, of Romeo and Juliet" to "The excellent Tragedie of Romeo and Juliet". The only explanation of this phenomenon which I have seen is set out by H. A. Evans in the introduction to the Griggs facsimile of Q1 (p. viii); he refers to Halliwell-Phillips' Outlines, p. 110. It is suggested that Danter brought out his spurious edition of the play while the authentic drama was still a new popular success: "delay was the principal evil to be avoided; the tide of popularity must be taken at the flood" (I quote Evans). He proceeds: "it is possible that in order to save time two presses were employed on the copy at once, and that in the one used for the later sheets the printer had to fall back upon a smaller fount of type".



Act II Scene iv.

- 818-20 The Q1 speech-headings are corrupt: two successive speeches are assigned to "Mer.". "Ben." should stand in front of 820, and "Mer." in front of 822. Hubbard attributes the muddle to the compositor (Wisconsin Studies no. 19 p. 6). Another instance of the assignation of consecutive speeches to the same character will be found at Q1 lines 1856, 1861. In the case before us it is quite easy to suppose that when beginning 820 the Q1 compositor's eye caught the previous assignation again, and that when he came to 822, and presumably saw in his 'copy' the assignation "Mer." he omitted it because he had already made Mercurio the speaker of the preceding two lines.
- 824 Q1 prefixes "I", presumably an actor's ejaculation.
- 825-6 Q1 "if hee bee challenged" Q2 "how he dares, being dared". Evidently the reporter forgot the exact wording of his original, and filled in the gap from previous material ("Some Challenge on my life" -- Q1 line 822, cf. Q2 line 8).
- 828 Q1 "shot thorough the eare" Q2 "runne through the eare". Capell first adopted the Q1 version here: Daniel (revised edition of Q2, p.116) argues for the retention of "runne", and likens the passage to Hamlet III iv 95 -- "These words like daggers enter in mine ears". I cannot regard "shot" as one of the Q1 readings which it is necessary for an editor to adopt: it seems to me that Q2 gives an attractive sequence -- Romeo is (a) "stabd", as with a dagger (b) "runne through...", as with a rapier: and (c) Cupid's arrow has cleaved the centre of his heart. Q1 misses this triple division, making both (b) and (c) refer to archery. "Shot" may well have occurred to the reporter through recollection of II i 14 -- "Young Abraham:Cupid he that shot so true (Q1 531 'trim')". Or he may merely have anticipated the reference to archery in "the very pinne of his heart cleft...." (Q2 II iv 15, Q1 829).
- 833 "I can tell you": this is not found at the corresponding point in Q2 (line 19). Possibly the reporter had in mind Q2 line 140, where the Nurse says "but first let me tell ye, if ye should leade her in a fooles paradise etc." The words "I can tell you" occur in Q2 line 104, but there they appear as a reply to the question "ca any of you tel me etc.".
- 834 "Catso" is a piece of actor's gag.

- 836 Q1 "rests me his minum rest" Q2 "he rests, his minum rests". Pope, Theobald, Hanmer, Warburton, Johnson read "he rests his minum rest"; Rowe (2nd ed.) deletes the "he". Malone adopted the Q1 reading, and all other editors follow him. The Q2 version is decidedly weaker and can be adequately accounted for as scribal or compositorial carelessness. The duplication of "rests" reminds us of Q2 I iv 44 -- "We waste our lights in vaine, lights lights by day".
- 842 "such.....affecting": note the Q1 inversion
- Hubbard considers Q1 "limping" a simple misprint of "lisp-ing" as in Q2 (Wisconsin Univ. Studies, 19, p.5).
- Q1's "fantasticoes" is clearly the correct reading; the Q2 "phantacies" is inappropriate from the point of view of sense. The scribe or compositor has, probably involuntarily, substituted the commoner word.
- 845 Q1 "is not this a miserable case" Q2 "is not this a lamet-able thing". With Q1 cf. IV v 101 -- "this is a pitifull (Q1 1880 'wofull') case", of which this is in all probability an inexact anticipation.
- 846 Q1 "pardonmees" Q2 "pardons mees". The words "O their bones, their bones" at the end of the speech (Q2 line 33, Q1 848) may, as Theobald suggested, contain a reference to the French word "bon". At the end of the next speech Mercutio gibes specifically at "Frenchified fuss". If "bones" bears this meaning there is a play on the word. Now it was originally suggested by Theobald that at II iv 31 the correct reading might be "pardonnez-mois": this might conceivably underlie Q2's "pardons mees". Qq. 4 & 5 emend to "pardona-mees", from which the old Cambridge editors evolved their reading "perdona-mi's". But before this could be accepted it would have to be shown that there was some authentic basis for the Q4 alteration. It seems to me quite possible that the Q2 "pardons mees" may be a piece of mere carelessness on the compositor's part, and that Q1 gives the correct reading. A similar error is found in Q2 line 61 of this scene -- "my wits faints". The reporter has no difficulty with the French "bon iour" (line 857): why then should "pardonmees" be regarded as a translation, when moreover it may be reasonably held to underlie the misprinted Q2 version?
- 850 There is no S.D. for Romeo's entry.
- 852 Q1 "Sirra": probably an actor's interpolation.
- 853 Q1 "but a kitchin drudg" Q2 "a kitchin wench". With Q1 cf. II v 74 (Q2 only) -- "I am the drudge, and toyle in

- your delight": an anticipation. The absence of "but" in Q2 is probably due to scribal or compositorial negligence; most modern editors agree with Pope's restoration of it.
- 857 Q1 "a French curtesie" Q2 "a French salutation". Probably Q1 anticipates Q2 line 47, Q1 862 -- "a man may straine curtesie".
- 865 "A most curteous exposition": Q1 loses the whole point of this through its omission of Q2 line 50 -- "Meaning to cursie".
- 870 Q1 "Well said" Q2 "Sure wit". Capell adopted the Q1 version; amongst the editors who follow him are the old Cambridge editors, Furness, Dowden, Ridley. But I can see absolutely nothing wrong with the Q2 reading. The reporter did not remember it, and substituted a commonplace phrase.
- 874 Q1 "for my wits faile" Q2 "my wits faints". F2 emends to "wit faints", Q5 to "wits faint". There is no reason to adopt "faile" from Q1, as Steevens did. Again the reporter has substituted a more commonplace word for the original.
- 876 Q1 "I haue done" Q2 "I am done". As far as I know Dowden is the only editor to revert to "I am done" since Capell adopted the Q1 version. It is conceivable that the Q2 transcriber was influenced by a recollection of I iv 36 where the pun gives special point to the verb "am" ("I am done/dun").
- 881 Q1 "with me" Q2 "there". Q1 repeats "with me" from the beginning of the same speech; the end of the preceding speech corroborates the Q2 reading here: compare the two sequences -- Q2 "with you there: with me....there", Q1 "with you there: with me.....with me". The reporter has failed to grasp the point of the arrangement.
- 884 Also 890, 891, 896. Within thirteen lines the reporter introduces the ejaculation "why" four times into speeches by Mercutio. In the corresponding portion of Q2 it appears only once (Q2 line 77, corresponding to Q1, 890). Perhaps the reporter remembered performances in which the actor of this part overworked the exclamation. "Tut man" (Q1 899: cf. Q2 line 85 'O') is probably a similar actor's ejaculation.
- 896 Q1 "...thou wouldst haue me stopp" Q2 "thou desirest me to stop". With Q1 cf. the next line -- "Thou wouldst else haue made thy tale large" (I quote Q2). The syntax is different; but it is possible that the reporter took a hint from the wording of the latter line as to how to stop a gap in his memory of the former one.

- 899 Q1 "I meant to make it short" Q2 "I would haue made it short". Q1 anticipates the end of the speech -- "and meant indeed to occupie the argument no longer".
- 910 Q1 "godyegooden" Q2 "good den". Q1 repeats from the preceding line, and the sense suffers.
- 922 Q1 "Well said" Q2 "You say well". The Q1 reading may depend on a recollection of Q2 line 102 -- "By my troth it is well said" (Q1 916). Cf. also Q2 IV iv 20 (see next note).
- 923 Q1 "mas well noted" Q2 "very well took". Probably the Q1 version inexactly anticipates IV iv 20 (Q2 only) -- "Masse and well said": possibly this is mingled with an anticipation of the word "note" in IV v 118-9 (Q1 1890).
- 926 Q1 "O, belike she meanes to inuite" Q2 "She will endite". Probably the Q1 version contains a recollection of 899 -- "I meant to make it short" (Q1 only), which depends upon anticipation of Q2 lines 86-7 -- "and meant indeed to occupie the argument no longer" (Q1 901).
- 935 Q1 "to supper" Q2 "to dinner". Q1 repeats from Q2 line 110 Q1 926.
- 947 Q1 "like a knaue" (not in Q2): the reporter has remembered that the word "knave" occurs in this speech in the authentic text ("scuruie knaue" line 129; "euey knaue" line 131) and has introduced it in a phrase of his own.
- Q1 "and see euerie Iacke" Q2 "and suffer euey knaue to": the reporter recollects "jack" from Q2 line 128 ("and twentie such Iacks"): at the point corresponding to this in Q1 the phrase is omitted.
- 949-51 Cf. Q2 lines 133-6. The reporter has involuntarily rearranged some of the Q2 phrases. Peter's mention of "my toole" (950) is peculiar to Q1 here, and is doubtless a recollection of I i 30 where Gregory says to Sampson "draw thy toole"; at the corresponding point in Q1 this is wanting.
- 953 Q1 "scuruie Iacke" Q2 "skuruie knaue". The Q1 variant is a recollection of Q2 line 128 -- "twentie such Iacks".
- 954 Q1 "seeke ye out" Q2 "enquire you out". The reporter seems to be fond of the phrase "to seek out": cf. Q2 I ii 35, 38 "find those persons out" "Find them out", Q1 169, 172 "seeke them out"; Q2 V ii 5 "to find a barefoote brother out", Q1 1974 "to seeke a barefoote Brother out". The only point where the phrase is used in Q2 is IV iii 56.



- 967-8 Q1 "Bid her get leaue..../To come to shrift to Frier Lawrence cell" Q2 "Bid her devise some means to come to shrift..../And there she shall at Frier Lawrence Cell/Be shrieued etc." Q1 anticipates II v 65 (Q2 only) where the Nurse asks Juliet "Have you got leaue to go to shrift to day?"
- Q1 "to morrow morning" (repeated in line 977) Q2 "this afternoon" (repeated in line 159). When Romeo goes to the Friar's cell to keep this appointment he says in Q1, in accordance with this variation, "This morning here she pointed we should meet" (line 1028). It is clear, however, that the difference does not imply behind Q1 an authentic version of the play with a different chronology; Juliet sends the Nurse to Romeo at nine o'clock in the morning of the second day of the action, in Q1 as in Q2 (see Q2 II ii 173-5, Q1 703-4 and Q2 II v 1, Q1 980). In Q2 the appointment for the marriage is made for that afternoon, the Nurse returns to Juliet, and tells her to go to Friar Laurence's cell (see II v 65-8) which she immediately does (see II v 76-7). In Q1 the appointment is made for the next morning; the Nurse returns to Juliet, and says to her (line 1012) "Goe, high you straight to Friar Laurence Cell" -- although the appointment is for the next morning Juliet is to go to keep it immediately! Yet in the next scene, only a few lines later, Romeo, keeping the same appointment, clearly implies that it is now the next morning (cf. Q1 lines 967 and 1028). Apparently between lines 1023 and 1024 the remainder of the second day and the whole of the second night of the action have passed! All that is involved in the different chronology of Q1 is a thorough confusion in the mind of the reporter. (Tycho Mommsen attributed the chronological errors to his bookseller's hack: see his prolegomena to the parallel-text edition of Qq. 1 and 2, pp. 159-60).
- 973 Q1 "my conduct" Q2 "my conuoy". Possibly the reporter has anticipated Q2 III i 120, where Romeo cries "fier eyed (Q2 misprints 'end') furie, be my conduct now" (Q1 line 1146). In writing "conduct" after "top-gallant" the reporter misses an image-sequence.
- 974-6 Cf. Q2 lines 156-8. Q1 misplaces this material.
- 977 Q1 "she shall not faile" Q2 "she shall be there". The Q1 version results from the reporter having recollected II ii 176: "Iu. What a clocke to morrow/Shall I send to thee?/Ro. By the houre of nine./Iu. I will not faile...." (Q1 line 705).
- 979 Q1 "Peter, take my fanne, and goe before" Q2 "Before and apace". The editors from Pope to Johnson adopted the Q1 version, but without the initial "Peter". Capell based his



reading on Q2, which he emended to "Before; and walk apace". Steevens was the first to adopt the Q1 version as it stands. The old Cambridge editors conflated, adding "and apace" to the Q1 line. I can see no reason at all for departing from Q2 here. Delius thought that the Q1 reading was revised by Shakespeare into that of Q2: he says "Shakespeare, having once before made the public laugh over Peter and the fan (see Q2 II iv 91-4, Q1 lines 905-7) struck out the repetition of the joke. But the editors cannot thus resign him, and therefore bring him to light again out of Q1" (Furness, p.143). But there is no question of revision: in all probability Dowden is right in saying that "the 'take my fan' of Q1 may have been an actor's repetition of the joke of line (93), and irresistible to an actor; but Q(2) and F are content to let the Nurse make her exit in all haste, without now thinking of her dignity" (Arden ed. p. 82). Of course, the repetition may be attributed to the reporter himself.

Act II Scene v.

- 980 Q1 "my Nurse" Q2 "the Nurse". Possibly Q1 anticipates III ii 31 (Q2 only) -- "O here comes my Nurse./And she brings newes".
- 982 Q1 "cannot finde him" (i.e. Romeo) Q2 "cannot meete him". The reporter was probably influenced by any or all of the following passages: at II iv 103 the Nurse asks "can any of you tel me wher I may find the yong Romeo?" (cf. Q1 917); at III ii 141 (Q2 only) the Nurse says to Juliet "Ile find Romeo...", and at III ii 145 she replies "O find him...".
- 983-5 In place of Q2 lines 4 ff. ("loues heraulds should be thoughts,/Which ten times faster glides then the Suns beames, etc.") Q1 has the following: "Loues heralds should be thoughts,/And run more swift than hastie powder fierd,/Doth hurrie from the fearfull Cannons mouth". The reporter has anticipated V i 66 ff. -- "And that the Trunke may be discharged of breath,/As violently, as hastie powder fierd/Doth hurry from the fatall Cannons wombe" (cf. Q1 lines 1951-3, where we find the words "a Cannons mouth"). In 984 the reporter uses the word "swift": he probably had a dim memory of II v 12-13, where Juliet says of the Nurse "Had she affections and warme youthfull bloud,/She would be as swift in motion as a ball".
- 986-7 Q1 "Tell me gentle Nurse,/What sayes my Loue?" Q2 "o hony Nurse what newes?" The reporter anticipates Q2 line 52 -- "sweete Nurse, tell me what sayes my loue?" There may also be an anticipation of IV iii 1 (Q2) where Juliet calls the Nurse "gentle Nurse".
- 988 Q1 "Lord how my bones ake" Q2 "Fie how my bones ake". The reporter has confused this with Q2 line 46 -- "Lord how my head akes" (cf. Q1 998): But he remembers "Fie", which he uses in line 992.
- 989 "Oh wheres my man? Giue me some aqua vitae": this is peculiar to Q1 here. The reporter has anticipated III ii 90, where the Nurse says "Ah wheres my man? giue me some Aqua-vitae" (at the point corresponding to this in Q1 the words are wanting).
- 992 "and my backe a tother side": the reporter anticipates Q2 line 48.
- 993 The Nurse's double expletive "Lord, Lord" is not used in the Q2 version of this scene; in that of Q1 it is repeated in

line 998 (also spoken by the Nurse) and line 1004 (in the mouth of Juliet). In Q2 the Nurse exclaims "Lord, Lord" at two points in II iv -- lines 148 and 172 -- but Q1 omits. Probably the reporter remembered that the Nurse used this exclamation somewhere, but, forgetting where she did so, introduced it into his version of II v, also giving it once to Juliet.

"what a case I am in": this is peculiar to Q1. Possibly the reporter has vaguely anticipated III iii 89 -- "O he is euen in my mistresse case" -- spoken by the Nurse (cf. Q1 line 1345).

994 "But tell me sweet Nurse, what sayes Romeo?" Two lines in the Q2 version of this scene are here conflated, viz. (1) line 52 "Sweete, sweete, sweete Nurse, tell me what sayes my loue?" (2) line 64 "Heres such a coyle, come what saies Romeo?"

996 "Hees no bodie": the reporter has remembered that "body" occurs in the authentic text of this speech (Q2 line 40 "...and for a hand and a foote and a body...": cf. Q1 line 997). He uses it in a phrase of his own.

"he is not a proper man": the reporter presumably recollected this phrase, peculiar here to Q1, from II iv 176 (where it appears in Q2 only) -- "and tell her that Paris is the properer man"; there also the Nurse is the speaker.

998 "thou hast it ifaith": I suggest anticipation of the phrase in III i 104 (Q2 only), where Mercutio says "I haue it, and soundly".

"how my head beates?": the reporter telescopes -- cf. Q2 lines 46-7: "...how my head akes,..../It beates.....".

1000 "What of all this?" Two Q2 phrases have been combined: (1) line 44 -- "But all this did I know before" (2) line 45 -- "what of that?"

Q1 "tell me what sayes he to our marriage?" Q2 "What sayes he of our marriage". The reporter has confused this with Q2 line 52 -- "tell me what sayes my loue?"

1007 "cannot you stay a while?" Here the reporter has recollected Q2 line 28.

1008-9 "next arrant (i.e. errand) youl haue done, euen doot your selfe": the reporter's memory of the Q2 line is vague (cf. Q2 line 63 -- "Henceforward do your messages your selfe"). He has constructed his own line, in which the word "arrant"

may have come through anticipation of Q2 III iii 82, where the Nurse says "Let me come in, and you shall know my errant:/ I come from Lady Juliet".

- 1010-1 "Nay stay sweet Nurse, I doo intreate thee now,/What sayes my Loue, my Lord, my Romeo?" Peculiar to Q1, these lines may safely be attributed to the reporter's invention. They seem to contain reminiscences of various fragments of the Q2 text: (1) "stay": cf. Q2 line 28 of this scene -- "can you not stay a while?" (Nurse); (2) "sweet Nurse": cf. Q2 line 52 "Sweete, sweete, sweete Nurse": (3) 1011: the reporter seems to have mixed up Q2 line 52 "tell me what sayes my loue?" and line 64 "what saies Romeo?" He may also have had at the back of his mind III v 44 where Juliet calls Romeo "loue, Lord, ay husband, friend" (the corresponding Q1 line -- 1476 -- has "my Lord, my Loue, my Frend").
- 1012 Q1 "hye you straight to Friar Laurence Cell" Q2 "high you hence to Frier Lawrence Cell". The word "straight" occurs in Q2 three lines further down: although this is in a line which Q1 omits, the word may have remained in the reporter's memory. Alternatively, compare the juxta-position of "straight" and "cell" in Q2 V ii 21-2, where Friar Laurence says "Get me an Iron Crow and bring it straight/Vnto my Cell".
- 1013 "And frame a scuse that you must goe to shrift". There is nothing corresponding to this in the Q2 version of this scene. Hoppe (R.E.S. 1938 p.275) says that it "is manifestly inspired by a line spoken by Romeo, II iv 191-2, 'Bid her devise Some means to come to shrift this afternoon'". It should further be noticed that in the Q2 version of II v itself Juliet talks of the "excuse" the Nurse makes for not telling her news at once (line 32). Although this occurs in a passage omitted by Q1, it is possible that the reporter remembered the word, in isolation, and used it later.
- 1014 Q1 "There stayes a Bridegroome to make you a Bride" Q2 "There stayes a husband to make you a wife". Q1 probably anticipates III v 119-20 -- "The Countie Paris at Saint Peters Church,/Shall happily make thee there a ioyfull Bride" (cf. Q1 1527; see also Q2 III v 122, Q1 1529). This naturally entails the use of "Bridegroome" also.
- 1016 "I must prouide a ladder made of cordes": this corresponds to Q2 lines 71-2 "I must an other way,/To fetch a Ladder". Hoppe (op. cit. p.276) points out that the Q1 version "bears a striking resemblance to the phrase, 'The ladder made of cords', in II iv 182 of The Two Gentlemen of Verona."
- 1018 Q1 "I must take paines...." Q2 "I am the drudge...". With Q1 cf. II iv 156, 165, where Romeo says to the Nurse

"here is for thy paines", "ile quit thy paines". Here her "paines" are taken in the same cause as that she refers to in Q1 1018.

- 1021-3 These three lines are peculiar to Q1. 1021 ("How doth her latter words reuiue my hart") may be a borrowing from 3 Henry VI, I i 163 -- "O Clifford, how thy words revive my heart!" With "gentle Nurse" cf. the note on lines 986-7. 1023 ("And Ile not faile to meete my Romeo") contains a reminiscence of II ii 176, where Juliet says to Romeo "I will not faile" (i.e. to send to him). In the authentic text the word "meet" occurs, in reference to Romeo and Juliet, at the following points: Act II Prologue lines 12-13, II ii 126, III v 52; cf. also II v 3.



Act II Scene vi.

In this scene the two Quartos diverge. Certain critics postulate a Shakespearian revision between the version represented by Q1 and that given in Q2. Steevens, for example, pronounces the scene "entirely new-formed after the first copy" (see Furness, p.148). The editors of the old Cambridge Shakespeare believe that the Q2 text is "substantially identical with the play as at first composed" but admit touches of revision here and there: comparing Q1 lines 1034-53 with Q2 II vi 16-36 they state that "in this place assuredly the change must be attributed to the author; but we know of no other passage of equal length where the same can be affirmed with certainty" (vol. VII, p.viii). Daniel (parallel text ed. of Qq. 1 and 2, intro. p.vii) includes the scene in a short list of passages of which he says "if they really existed in the original play in anything like the form they present in Q1 they must have been re-written for Q2"; he points out that here the "essential differences between the two quartos cannot be accounted for as the result of imperfect note-taking during the performance". Dowden agrees with Daniel that certain passages must have been entirely re-written (see Arden ed. Romeo, intro. p. xiii and Appendix I, pp. 183-4). Some critics who hold that behind the Q1 version there lies a stage of the play's history anterior to that found in Q2 find Q1 lines 1024-53 in whole or in part non-Shakespearian. This is the view of Grant White (see Furness, pp. 148-9) who singles out as quite definitely un-Shakespearian lines 1026-33, 1044-5, 1050-1. Professors Pollard and Dover Wilson (T.L.S. 1919 p.434) develop the hypothesis that Q1 was printed from the MS. of a pre-Shakespearian Romeo partially revised by Shakespeare (and containing interpolations from the final version, made by a pirate-actor); thus the Q1 version of II vi is an unrevised portion of the early play. F. G. Hubbard (Wisconsin Univ. Studies, no. 19, p. 23) calls attention to the "antique character" of this among other Q1 passages (I presume that "iv" is a misprint for "vi"): his theory is (p.23) that in these passages "we have...portions of the old play upon which the Shakespearian version of Q1 is founded". There is absolutely no difficulty about believing that the Q1 version of II vi contains non-Shakespearian matter; but Chambers has another explanation of its presence (see William Shakespeare, vol. 1, p. 345). Having noted II vi among the non-Shakespearian matter in Q1 he proceeds "I do not see that we need look for an author beyond the reporter. If he was an actor, as is probable enough, we know from Henslowe's records that many actors, without becoming habitual playwrights like Shakespeare and Heywood, were able to turn out a play upon occasion; and the style

of the 'Greene-Lodge school' is just what such men might be expected to use, after better poets had grown out of it". H. R. Hoppe (R.E.S. 1938 pp. 277 ff.) develops the same hypothesis: he suggests that the scene may have been cut in an abridgement, that the reporter was an actor who had played in the abridged version, that he had at one time been familiar with the full version, that he occasionally remembered fragments of the excised passages (some of which he inserted at other points in his reported version), and that he filled in some of the cuts with verse of his own embedded in which we sometimes find reminiscences of various passages in other places and even of passages from other plays. The Chambers-Hoppe theory is better than that of Tycho Mommsen (Athenaeum, 1857, p.182; prolegomena to the parallel-text edition of Qq. 1 and 2, section V), who would attribute the Q1 version of II vi, along with other passages where Q1 diverges decidedly from Q2, to a book-seller's hack filling gaps in defective notes taken during performance; for an actor-reporter-versifier could much more easily be credited with the reminiscences referred to. I am convinced that Chambers and Hoppe are right. Just as is the case with the Friar's long speech at Q1 lines 2149 ff. (see section I of my introduction), and just as we shall find in the lamentation-passages at lines 1838 ff. (see note), so here we come upon reminiscences of various passages in the authentic version of the play and in other plays. See Hoppe, op. cit. pp. 277-80.

1024 "Now Father Laurence": in Q2 at II iii 31 Romeo salutes the Friar with the words "Goodmorrow father"; at III iii 4 he says "Father what newes?" (cf. Q1 1267). A reminiscence of these greetings may have become fused with the words "Friar Laurence" which appear in the authentic text at II iv 155, II v 67, IV ii 10.

1024-5 "In thy holy grant/Consists the good of me and Iuliet": this appears to contain a reminiscence of Richard III, IV iv 406 -- "In her consists my happiness and thine". The Q1 material is also indebted to a recollection of the content of II iii 52-3 where Romeo says to the Friar "both (,) our remedies/Within thy helpe and holy phisicke lies". That this passage was in the reporter's mind is shown by a trace they leave on 1027, where the Friar says he will do his best to make them happy "if in me it lye". "Holy grant" corresponds exactly to "holy phisicke": as for the word "grant" itself I suspect a momentary recollection of I v 107-8

1026 "Without more words I will do all I may": Hoppe suggests that the first three words of this line may be a reminiscence of Taming of the Shrew, I ii 232 -- "(Tranio) ..is

it any offence?/Gremio No; if without more words you will get you hence".

- 1028 "This morning here she pointed we should meet": It was not Juliet, but Romeo, who made the appointment (see Q1 lines 967-8, Q2 II iv 154). Hoppe says that this line "is an evident summing-up of the result of Romeo's meeting with Juliet's Nurse, II iv 191 ff., influenced probably by her words, in the First Quarto version (977), "Well, to-morrow morning she shall not fail". The juxtaposition of "appoint" and "meet" or "meeting" is, of course, very common: not impossibly, however, the reporter had at the back of his mind Hermia's words to Lysander, M.N.D. I i 177-8 -- "In that same place thou hast appointed me,/To-morrow truly will I meet with thee". For the difference in chronology between the Qq. see note on Q1 977.
- 1029-30 "And consummate those neuer parting bands,/Witnes of our harts loue by ioyning hands": possibly the reporter was influenced by anticipation of IV i 56 (Q2 only), where Juliet says to the Friar "God ioynd my heart, and Romeos thou our hands". Note also the words "my heart's dear love" in Q2 at II ii 119 and II iii 57. The reporter has produced a conventional couplet in the antique style which Shakespeare hit off in the inset play in Hamlet (cf. III ii 154-5, where the Player-King finishes his first speech with the couplet "Since love our hearts and Hymen did our hands/ Unite commutual in most sacred bands").
- 1033 "Youths loue is quicke, swifter than swiftest speed": the reporter appears to have remembered the Friar's injunction in the Q2 version of II vi (lines 14-5) -- "Therefore loue moderately, longloue doth so,/Too swift arriues, as tardie as too slowe". He reproduces the same idea, and catches up the solitary word "swift". It is possible that he was also influenced by a vague recollection of Q2 II v 12-3, where Juliet says of the Nurse "Had she affections and warme youthfull bloud,/She would be as swift in motion as a ball...".
- 1034 "See where she comes": in Q2 at I i 149 Benvolio says "See where he comes", speaking of Romeo. But the reporter more probably anticipated Q2 IV ii 14, where the Nurse says, of Juliet, "See where she comes from shrift with merie looke".
- 1035 "So light of foote nere hurts the troden flower": White considered this "a daintier and more graceful, and therefore it would seem, a more appropriate figure" than that of Q2 (see Furness, p.148). It is certainly a beautiful figure, but not more appropriate in the Friar's mouth;



the implied comparison between the light foot of youth in love and the "euerlasting flint" starts the train of thought which leads him to the characteristic conclusion "so light is vanitie". I can see no necessity for attributing the Q1 line to Shakespeare and postulating revision; even a versifier of moderate powers may occasionally strike on a good image. And granted that 1035 is a good line, 1036 (which completes the couplet) sinks with a vengeance. It seems most likely that the reporter has remembered (in-exactly) the words "Oh so light a foote" in Q2 line 16, and, using them, worked up a couplet of his own.

1037 It must be owned that the reporter had some very good ideas. Hoppe suggests that "the manner of Juliet's entrance seems to have impressed" him (op. cit. p.278 footnote 1): in this connection he refers to the vivid stage-direction after line 1033 -- "Enter Iuliet somewhat fast, and embraceth Romeo". Her first words in the Q2 version are a polite salutation of the Friar (line 21); the reporter makes her exclaim "Romeo". Only Romeo is of real importance to her. It is very important to notice that Q2 line 21 ("Good euen to my ghostly confessor") seems to be anticipated in Q1 at line 751 ("Good morrow to my Ghostly Confessor"); this supports Hoppe's contention that the Reporter had some knowledge of the authentic version of II vi.

1038-40 Hubbard (op. cit. p.24) lists stylistic parallels in earlier plays -- James IV, I iii 89; Edward II, ed. Brooke lines 863-5; Soliman and Perseda, I ii 42-3; Looking Glass for London, ed. Collins I p.170; Edward I, sc. i lines 91-4. Hoppe refers to these parallels, and suggests that the reporter "was merely rephrasing image-patterns surviving from his participation in other plays".

1042-3 "Jul: I am (if I be Day)/Come to my Sunne: shine foorth, and make me faire." White considers that this "has a touch of poetry more exquisite and more dramatic than is to be found in the rewritten scene" (Furness, p.148). But, although Hoppe does not mention the lines, they fit his theory well. The reporter-versifier may well have been influenced by a dim memory of two separate passages in the full play: (1) at II ii 2-3 Romeo, seeing Juliet at her window, exclaims "what light through yonder window breaks?/It is the East, and Iuliet is the Sun" (cf. Q1 lines 558-9); (2) at III ii 17 Juliet says "Come night, come Romeo, come thou day in night" -- Romeo is the "day" which is to come to her at night. This latter passage occurs in the middle of a large block of text which Q1 omits (III ii 5-31): but we have other evidence that the reporter knew something of this omitted passage, for Q1 line 1205 contains the words "To

Phoebus mansion" (Q2 III ii 2 "Towards Phoebus lodging") which seems to anticipate Q2 III ii 26 -- "O I haue bought the mansion of a loue...", which also occurs in the long passage omitted in Q1.

- 1044-5 "Rom: All beauteous fairnes dwelleth in thine eyes. Iul: Romeo from thine all brightness doth arise." Hoppe suggests that this "may be a refurbishment of Romeo's comparisons of Juliet's eyes to stars in II ii 15" (cf. "two of the fairest starres...."). It seems to me more probable that, if the couplet is to be derived from reminiscences of other passages, we should cite I i 188 where love is called "a fire sparkling in louers eies", which may have been mingled with "sleep dwell upon thine eyes" (II ii 195) and perhaps "the brightness of her cheek" (II ii 18). But it would be safer to attribute the Q1 lines to the Reporter's invention: the formulae he uses are highly conventional.
- 1046 "Come wantons, come, the stealing houres do passe": Hoppe suggests that this "may be a mingling of 'Now comes the wanton blood.....' a few lines before in the previous scene, II v 72, and Richard III, III vii 168 "....the stealing hours of time".
- 1048-9 "Part for a while, you shall not be alone,/Till holy Church haue ioynd ye both in one". This corresponds closely to the concluding couplet in the Q2 version of the scene -- "For by your leaues, you shall not stay alone,/Till holy Church incorporate two in one". Again there appears to be an anticipation of IV i 56 -- "God ioynd my heart, and Romeos thou our hands".
- 1050 "Lead holy Father, all delay seemes long": at IV i 37 in the 'good' text Juliet calls Laurence "holy Father" (cf. Q1 line 1673). In 1050 there may also be a reminiscence of I i 156 where Benvolio says "Ay me, sad houres seeme long". "Delay" occurs in Q2 in I iv 43, II v 32, and III v 209 (where we find the words "Delay this marriage").
- 1051 "Make hast, make hast": possibly a reminiscence of Q2 IV iv 27 -- "Make hast, the bridegroome, he is come already, make hast I say" (cf. also IV iv 16).
- 1051-3 "Make hast, make hast, this lingring doth vs wrong. Fr: O, soft and faire makes sweetest worke they say. Hast is a common hindrer in crosse way." The content of this corresponds to that of Q2 II iii 96-7 (omitted in Q1): Romeo and the Friar are together: Romeo says "O let vs hence, I stand on sudden hast" and the Friar replies "Wisely and slow, they stumble that run fast". Cf. also Q2 II vi 15 -- "Too swift arriues, as tardie as too



slowe". The wording of 1052-3 seems to be the reporter's own, although "in crosse way" (i.e. on a road beset with difficulties) may be indebted to an anticipation of IV iii 4-5 (Q2 only), where Juliet refers to "my state,/Which well thou knowest, is crosse and full of sin".

Act III Scene i.

- 1055 Q2 omits "are" (line 2), necessary to the metre and present in Q1.
- 1059 Q1 "the next cup of wine" Q2 (line 8) "the second cup". With Q1 cf. "a cup of wine" in the authentic text at I ii 79.
- 1062 Q1 "being mooude" Q2 "in thy moode". With Q1 cf. I i 5 ff. -- Sampson I strike quickly being moued. / Gregory But thou art not quickly moued to strike....
- A phrase necessary to the sense is omitted in Q1, which seems to require "as any in Italie" after "being mooude" as in Q2 (lines 11-12).
- 1067 Q1 "Didst thou not fall out with a man" Q2 "thou wilt quarell with a man". Q1 anticipates lines 24-5 of the authentic text -- "Didst thou not fall out with a taylor..."
- 1069 Q2's "spie" (line 20) is obviously right, following "eye"; Q1 misses this sequence, using the ordinary phrase "would haue pickt out such a quarell".
- 1075 SD. Q1 provides only for the entry of Tybalt, and the text has "a Capolet" for Q2's "the Capulets" (line 32). This suggests abridgement behind Q1.
- 1080-1 Q1 "if I haue occasion" Q2 "and you will giue me occasion". With Q1 cf. II iv 134-5 in Q2, where Peter says "I dare draw assoone as an other man, if I see occasion in a goodquarel,....".
- By substituting "I haue" for "you will giue" and by omitting "without giuing" in line 1081 Q1 misses the point of the witticism.
- 1083 Q1's "Zwounes consort?" anticipates the end of the speech in the authentic text (lines 44-5).
- The substitution of "fiddlers" for Q2's "Minstrels" (line 42) anticipates "heeres my fiddlesticke" (Q1 1085, Q2 line 44).
- 1087-9 Q1 has an imperfect prose version for the verse of Q2, clearly owing to imperfect memorial transmission.
- 1090-4 Although set as prose this is metrical apart from the words "villaine am I none" which protrude.

- 1090 "the hate I beare to thee" Q2 "the loue I beare thee".  
The Q2 "loue" is undoubtedly correct; it is spoken ironically. The reporter(s) fail to appreciate the irony, and substitute the literally appropriate "hate". I can see no force in Ulrici's statement that "Tybalt" appears to be too wild and furious to avail himself of ironical expressions" (see Furness, p.155). In Q2 the speech has point and thrust; in Q1 Tybalt merely says in effect 'I hate you so much that I can call you nothing better than a villain' -- a decidedly anaemic statement for "the furious Tybalt" to make.
- 1092 Q1 "Tybalt the loue I beare to thee, doth excuse...." Q2 "Tybalt, the reason that I haue to loue thee, / Doth much excuse...". The Q1 version is modelled on the construction of 1090 (Q2 line 56).
- 1097-9 This is metrical, but arranged as prose. The previous speech is garbled in Q1 (1095-6); the presence of the word "iniured" in 1097 implies that "iniuries" should stand in the preceding speech as in Q2 (line 62).
- 1100-1 Q1 loses the metre and prints this as prose.  
  
Q1 "come backe, come backe" Q2 "will you walke?" With the Q1 version cf. line 169 in Q2, where Benvolio, describing these events, says "But by and by" Tybalt "comes backe to Romeo": cf. also line 117 in that text, where Benvolio exclaims "Here comes the furious Tybalt backe againe".
- 1104-5 Q1 has the commonplace "drawe your rapier out of your scabard" in place of Q2's more piquant "plucke your sword out of his pikher by the eares": defective memory on a reporter's part will account for this. Q1 also substitutes "rapier" for "sword" at line 1057. There is probably an anticipation of Q2 line 79 "put thy Rapier vp" (omitted in Q1).
- 1106-7 Q1 greatly compresses: the fight is described in a stage-direction. Cf. Q1 line 42, where again a fight is described in an elaborate stage-direction, the surrounding dialogue being greatly attenuated. At moments of excited action reporters tend to forget the dialogue.  
  
"Stay Tybalt, hould Mercutio" anticipates the last line of Romeo's speech in Q2 (line 85), reproducing it inexactly.
- 1108-30 There are many variations of order between the two Qq. Q1 misplaces many words and phrases. That it depends on memory at some stage in its transmission is made clear by the reading "the wound is not deepe" (Q2 "the hurt cannot

be much") which anticipates Mercutio's "not so deepe as a well", and by the phrase "for the first and second cause" which is a recollection of II iv 23-4 (Q1 lines 838-9): this recollected phrase forms the last part of a rhyming couplet, Mercutio's forecast of his epitaph. This, and indeed the obviously memorial element in the transmission of the entire passage, suggests that Mercutio's talk of being fairly mounted on four men's shoulders, of the peasantly sexton, and the mumbling surgeon, not found in the Q2 version, is not to be traced to a version of the play earlier than that of Q2; an actor may have spoken more than was set down for him, or a reporter may have brought in invention to aid a defective memory. The material peculiar to Q1 is, however, quite in the manner of Mercutio.

- 1132 Q1 has "wound" for the Q2 "hurt" (noun). The same variation occurs earlier at 1110 (Q2 line 92). At III ii 54, speaking of Tybalt, fatally wounded like Mercutio in a duel, the Nurse says "I saw the wound...." (Q1 1217).
- 1135 Q1 omits "sweete" (Q2 line 109) which is metrically necessary.
- 1140 Q1 has "scornd the lowly earth", Q2 (line 114) "here did scorne the earth". Ridley adopts the Q1 reading, and it seems stronger than that of Q2.
- 1142 SD. The direction for Tybalt's entry is wanting in Q2; it is, of course implied in line 117 of that text.
- 1144 Q1 "A liue in tryumph" Q2 "He gan in triumph". The Q1 reading is probably the correct one. For a discussion of the possible significance of that of Q2 see the introduction.
- 1146 "eyed": Q2 misprints this as "end" (line 120).
- 1148-9 In Q1 Mercutio's soul is "aboue the cloudes", in Q2 "aboue our heads". The Q1 version probably contains a recollection of Q2 line 113, where Benvolio says that Mercutio's "spirit hath aspir'd the Clowdes": cf. also Q2 IV v 76-7, where the Friar says of the supposedly dead Juliet that "she is aduanst / Aboue the Clowdes".
- 1151 That the initial "Or" of Q1 is metrically smoother than Q2's "Either" does not necessarily indicate that it is the correct reading.
- 1152-4 Again Q1 garbles a speech delivered amidst confused action. Note the variations of order between the two Qq.

- Q1 "The Citizens approach" Q2 "The Citizens are vp": with Q1 cf. I i 100, where Benvolio narrates how the servants of Capulet and Montague were "close fighting ere I did approach", and V iii 8, where Paris instructs the boy to whistle "as signall that thou hearest some thing approach", and *ibid.* line 18 -- "The Boy giues warning, something doth approach" (found also in Q1 line 2006).
- 1155 Q1 "fortunes slaue" Q2 "fortunes foole". With Q1 cf. *Richard II* V v 24 -- "They are not the first of fortune's slaves, / Nor shall not be the last".
- 1156 Q1 does not assign this speech, but it is the first line of a page (sig. F2 v) and the catchword at the bottom of the preceding page is "Watch: Vp".
- 1166 Q1 has "Vnhappie sight?", not found here in Q2. Cf. Q2 V iii 182, where, seeing Paris and Juliet lying dead, the Watchman exclaims "Pittifull sight".
- 1169 Q1 "Speake Benuolio who began this fray?" Q2 "Benuolio, who began this bloudie fray?" In the first scene of the play there is an exactly parallel situation; Benvolio is required to describe how an affray began. At I i 97-8 Montague asks Benvolio "Who set this auncient quarell new abroach? / Speake Nephew, were you by when it began?"
- 1173-4 These two lines, peculiar to Q1, occupy a position corresponding to Q2 lines 153 (2nd part)-163 (1st part). The epithet "stout" applied to Mercutio is an anticipation of Q2 line 168. The lines are not beyond the power of a versifying reporter or hack-poet. There is an interesting similarity with a speech of Capulet's at III v 131-42: he says that Juliet counterfeits at once "a Barke, a Sea, a Wind" (line 135), which in Q1 (line 1537) becomes "a sea, a barke, a storme"; and, proceeding to particularise, he says that "the windes" are "thy sighes", / Who raging with thy teares and they with them, / Without a sudden calme will ouerset / Thy tempest tossed body" (Q1 paraphrases this). Cf. also I v 60 (Q1 434), where Capulet asks Tybalt "wherefore storme you so?"
- 1175 "Which Romeo seeing cal'd stay Gentlemen". Cf. line 82 in the Q2 version of this scene, where Romeo says "Gentlemen, for shame forbear this outrage". In the corresponding passage in Q1 (line 1106) we have "Stay Tibalt, hould Mercutio", which is an inexact anticipation of Q2 line 85 "Hold Tybalt, good Mercutio".
- 1176 "And on me cry'd, who drew to part their strife". Cf. Q2 lines 171-2 of this scene, where Benvolio says "ere I /



Could draw to part them, was stout Tybalt slaine". Cf. also I i 101; Benvolio acts as peacemaker there also, and, as in Q1 1176 actually draws -- "I drew to part them". At line 177 of this scene in Q2, Lady Capulet, referring to this brawl in which Tybalt and Mercutio have been killed, says "Some twentie of them fought in this blacke strife". This is probably anticipated in Q1 1176.

1177 Q1's "agill" corrects the Q2 error "aged" (line 165).

1177-8 Q1 And with his agill arme yong Romeo

As fast as tongue cryde peace, sought peace to make.  
This is a reporter's contamination of Q2 lines 164-5:-  
and swifter then his tongue

His aged (sic) arme beates downe their fatall poynts,... This has been confused with other passages: cf. I i 61, where Tybalt comes on Benvolio with his sword drawn amidst the servants' brawl and Benvolio exclaims "I do but keepe the peace, put vp thy sword" (not in Q1). Cf. also, in the present scene, Q2 lines 156-7: Romeo's entreaties "Could not make truce with the vnruely spleene / Of Tybalt deafe to peace".

1179 "While they were enterchanging thrusts and blows": this is a verbatim recollection of I i 106 (except that "we" is changed to "they" in accordance with a difference of context): the line is omitted in Q1 at the point corresponding to its occurrence in Q2.

1181 "The furious Tybalt" is a recollection of Q2 line 117 of this scene (Q1 line 1143).

1184 "rapier": cf. Q2 line 79 of this scene, where Romeo says "Gentle Mercutio, put thy Rapier vp".

1186 "ere I could draw forth my rapier": cf. the corresponding passage in Q2 "ere I / Could draw to part them", and also Q1 1104-5 "drawe your rapier out of your scabard".

1187 "to part their furie": cf. 1176 "to part their strife"; 'furie' may be extracted from "the furious Tybalt" (Q1 1143, 1181: Q2, this scene, 117): cf. also Q2 line 120 of this scene, where Romeo, burning for revenge on Tybalt, cries "fire-eyed fury be my conduct now".

1188 Q1 "And this way Romeo fled" Q2 (line 173) "And as he fell, did Romeo turne and flie": the Q1 version may contain a reminiscence of II i 5, adapted to a different context; there Benvolio, the same speaker as here, says of Romeo "He ran (Q1 came) this way". Note that from Q2's "as he fell" Q1 derives the phrase "downe did Tybalt fall" which

is substituted for Q2's "was stout Tybalt slaine" (line 1187).

1194 Although the Q1 sequence is good this odd half-line suggests that Q2 lines 181-5 are actually omitted in Q1, probably through abridgement.

1196 Q2's "hearts" (line 188) is corrupt; Q1 gives the true reading "hates" (i.e. hate's).

1200 Q1's "I" is right; Q2 "It" (line 192) is probably a printing-house error.

1202-3 Q1 has a final couplet different from that of Q2:

Q1 Pittie shall dwell and gouerne with vs still:  
Mercie to all but murdrers, pardoning none that kill.

Q2 Beare hence this body, and attend our will,  
Mercie but murders, pardoning those that kill.

It is probable that the alexandrine in Q1 merely misrepresents the pentameter of Q2; the idea contained in Q2's final line is a difficult one, and it is reasonable to suppose that the reporter(s) could not grasp it and substituted a trite idea for it, in almost the same language, incidentally corrupting the metre. The supplying by reporters of a line of their own invention to complete a rhymed couplet of which they can recollect only one line (generally inexactly) appears in other "bad" quartos: cf. Q1 Hamlet, the prayer scene, where the King finishes with the couplet

My wordes fly vp, my sinnes remaine belowe.

No King on earth is safe, if Gods his foe.

Of this, only the first line corresponds to the 'good' texts, which have

My words fly up, my thoughts remain below.

Words without thoughts never to heaven go.

Note here too how the reporter has changed the meaning of the line he did remember.

Act III Scene ii.

- 1205 Q1 "To Phoebus mansion" Q2 "Towards Phoebus lodging". Q1 anticipates line 26 of this scene (in Q2 only) -- "O I haue bought the mansion of a loue....".
- 1206 Q1 "would quickly bring you thether" Q2 "would whip you to the west". Q1 anticipates line 132 of this scene (in Q2 only) -- "I will bring you thither". Note "bring" in Q2 line 4, for which Q1 substitutes "send" (1207).
- 1208-9 Q1 greatly compresses Q2 lines 31-5, but preserves regular metre.  
Q1 "O Lord, why lookst thou sad?" is a recollection of II v 20, where it is found in Q2 only.
- 1210-6 Q1 gives a very garbled version of Q2 lines 36-46. Note "alacke we are vndone" where "alacke" anticipates "Alack the day"; and also the separation and misplacement of Q2 lines 45-6 (Q1 1212, 1214).
- 1219 Note Q1's inversion.
- 1220 Q1 "All pale" Q2 "Pale, pale". The Q1 reading has been affected by the words which that text omits -- "all bedawbde in bloud,/All in goare bloud" (Q2 lines 57-8).
- 1221-5 In place of Q2 lines 59-62 Q1 has these five lines peculiar to itself, all metrically regular. They appear to have been supplied by a versifying reporter or hack-poet in place of a forgotten speech. A full analysis appears in the introduction.
- 1227 Note Q1's inversion.
- 1229 Q1 "Is Tybalt dead, and Romeo murdered:" Q2 "Is Romeo slaughtred? and is Tybalt dead?" Again Q1 has inversion. Cf. also III iii 68 (Q1 line 1327) where we have "Tybalt murdered".
- 1230 Q1 "My deare loude cousen, and my dearest Lord" Q2 "My dearest Cozen, and my dearer Lord". Q1 misses the point.
- 1233 Q1 "Tybalt is dead, and Romeo banished" (Q2 gone). Q1 gives the line exactly as it reappears in Q2 at line 115 of this scene. Possibly Q2's 'gone' is the result of transcriber's or compositor's eye having caught again the last word of the previous line: alternatively one or the other may have retained that word in his mind.

- 1234 Q1 "murdred" (vb. active) Q2 "kild". With Q1 cf. III iii 109-10 and V iii 49-50.
- 1236-7 Q1 assigns the speeches wrongly.
- 1238-59 This passage, corresponding to Q2 lines 76-142, is very badly reported.
- 1238 "O painted sepulcher including filth". This single line appears in place of Q2 lines 76-84. It is peculiar to Q1, and would be attributed on Hoppe's theory to the reporter-versifier's invention, on Mommsen's to the hack-poet.
- 1248 "All this is comfort". This phrase shows that material necessary to the sense has been omitted: Q1 does not tell us what it is that is comfort. We have to go to Q2 to render Q1 intelligible, supplying from it lines 108-9 -- "My husband liues that Tybalt would haue slaine,/And Tybalts dead that would haue slain my husband:".
- 1251-2 Q1 "Ah that word Banished / Is worse than death" Q2 "that one word banished, / Hath slaine ten thousand Tybalts". Q1 combines this passage in Q2 with lines 111-2 -- "Some word there was, worser than Tybalts death / That murdred me,...". The Q1 lines under discussion state, however, that Romeo's banishment is worse than death, not that it is a worse calamity than Tybalt's death: the force of the lines is that of III iii 13-15, where Romeo says to the Friar that "exile hath more terror in his looke, / Much more than death" (Q1 1277-8 ".....lookes, / Than death it selfe".)
- 1253 There is a bad dislocation of sequence here. Obviously material necessary to the sense is omitted in Q1: "to speake that word" must be supplied from Q2 (line 125).
- Similarly, at 1258 Q1's "theirs" implies the omission of a line corresponding to Q2 line 133 -- "Wash they his wounds with teares?"
- 1258-9 Note the partial inversion in Q1:  
 Q1 "when theirs are spent / Mine shall be shed"  
 Q2 "mine shall be spent, / When theirs are drie".



Act III Scene iii.

- 1276 Q1 "Banished" Q2 "banishment". The Q2 reading is clearly correct; Romeo echoes the word the Friar has just spoken. Q1 anticipates Romeo's reiteration of the word "banished" after the Friar's use of it at Q2 line 16 (Q1 1279).
- 1278 Q1 "Than death it selfe" Q2 "Much more then death". With Q1 cf. IV 1 76 (Q1 1700): there the Friar says to Juliet that if, to avoid marrying Paris, she is willing to commit suicide, "Then is it likely thou wilt vndertake/A thing like death to chide away this shame,/That coapst with death (,) himselfe to scape from it" (clearly the comma in the last line is an error): the Q1 version has "That coapst with death it selfe to flye from blame".
- 1279 Q1 "Hence from Verona" Q2 "Here from Verona". It seems likely that Q1 has the right reading; at line 20 Q2 itself has "Hence banished". But Johnson, Capell, Knight, Delius, the old Cambridge editors, and others, support Q2.
- 1284 Q1 "banishment" Q2 "banished" (line 22). It can be argued that Q1 is right here, and that the Q2 compositor's eye caught once again the last word of the previous line. On the other hand there is a good deal to be said in favour of the Q2 reading; clearly the Friar's "banished" at line 16 has taken root in Romeo's mind: "calling death banished" is no more ungrammatical than the immediately preceding "banished is death, mistermd", and in any case grammatical considerations are hardly relevant. Ulrici and Delius both comment on Romeo's passionate obsession with the word: the old Cambridge editors also adopt the Q2 reading.

The same point emerges in the variation between Q1 1305 and Q2 line 48: Q1 "hadst thou....no present meane of death,/ Though nere so meane, but banishment/To torture me withall" Q2 "Hadst thou.....No sudden meane of death, though nere so meane, / But banished to kill me": the Q2 reading is corroborated by the fact that immediately after this Romeo bursts out again "Banished?/O Frier, the damned vse that word in hell", and this appears in Q1 also (1306-7) as "ah, banished./O Frier, etc.". The Friar's "from Verona art thou banished" obsesses Romeo; this is seen also at Q2 lines 58-9, Q1 1316-7: the Friar offers Romeo philosophy. "To comfort thee though thou art (Q1 be) banished", where-upon Romeo exclaims "Yet banished?"

I can see no argument against adopting the Q2 readings in these two places in the fact that Romeo himself uses the



word "banishment" in Q2 at line 55 (Q1 1313). But the matter is one for the individual editorial judgement.

- 1300 Q1 "kisses" Q2 "blessing". Daniel finds evidence of revision in Q2 lines 38-45 of this scene: and he argues that one element in this revision was the alteration of "kisses" to "blessing" in this line, and the use of "kisses" in an added line (Q2 line 40 "as thinking their owne kisses sin"). Hoppe suggests that the Q1 "kisses" may be an anticipation of a word in a passage which Q1 itself omits. On this question see Introduction (under the section "Revision in Q2?").
- 1303-6 Q1 misdivides, and has one line (1305) a foot short.
- 1306 Q1 "To torture me withall" Q2 "to kill me". By the expansion Q1 recovers its metre. The Q1 version probably contains a recollection of Q2 line 30 (Q1 1292), where Romeo says of his banishment "'Tis torture and not mercy". Cf. also Q2 line 19 (Q1 1282).
- 1312 Q1 "heare me but speake a word" Q2 "heare me a little speake". With the Q1 version cf. III v 164 (Q2), where Juliet entreates her father to "Heare me with patience, but to speake a word". But Malone adopted the Q1 version as the true reading.
- 1333-40 Q1 gives a mere sketch of the dialogue; again excited bustling action has an adverse effect on a reporter's recollection of the dialogue. Note the variations of order, and also how the Friar's two-line speech in Q1 (1333-4), consisting of fragments of the Q2 version pieced together, is nevertheless perfectly metrical.
- 1336: Q1 "wilfulness" Q2 "simpleness". Q1 may here contain a momentary confusion of Romeo's "simpleness" and Tybalt's "wilfull choller" (I v 92, found in both Qq.). But many editors read "wilfulness", including Pope, Collier, Singer, Hudson, Staunton, White, Halliwell, Keightley. I cannot, however, see any argument against "simpleness".
- 1342 Q1's initial "Where is" is metrically better than Q2's "Wheres" (line 86) which may be the result of careless reading of the 'copy'.
- 1348 Note the Q1 inversion.
- 1353 Q2 omits "Well" (line 97), present in Q1 and necessary to the metre.
- 1356 Q1 "her" Q2 "our". The Q1 reading may be due to the compositor's eye having caught the end of the next line ("..her owne").

- 1360 Q1 "weepes and pules" Q2 "weeps and weeps". With Q1 cf. III v 193, where, in Q2, Capulet calls Juliet "a wretched puling foole".
- 1361 Q1 "now on the ground" Q2 "and then starts vp". Q1 reminds us of two points a little earlier in this scene, where Romeo's grief is dealt with: (i) line 72 (Q1 1331) -- if you were in my case, Romeo tells the Friar, then you might also "fall vpon the ground as I do now": (ii) line 87 (Q1 1343) -- the Nurse enquires "Where's Romeo?" and the Friar replies "There on the ground, / With his owne teares made drunke".
- 1362 Note Q1's inversion of "calls" and "cries".
- 1363 The slight metrical dislocation in Q1 suggests that Q2's line 107 ("And then downe falls againe") has been omitted.
- 1365 Q1 "Ah tell me holy Fryer" Q2 "Oh tell me Frier, tell me,". With Q1 cf. Q2 line 85 of this scene -- "O tell me holy Frier", Q1 1341 "tell mee oh holy Fryer".
- 1367-8 Q1 substitutes the commonplace "lye" for Q2's "lodge", thus losing the sequence "lodge.....mansion".
- 1369 The Nurse's "Ah?" is probably an actor's ejaculation, a trace of performances behind the memorial report.
- 1370-2 Q1 reports the 'good' text imperfectly, but has its own metre.
- 1379 Probably Q2's "lies" (line 123) is a misprint for "liues": with this emendation the Q2 line is probably the correct one. There is no need to adopt the Q1 version entirely, as Pope and Hanmer did.
- 1382 Q2's awkward metre in the latter half of line 144 suggests the accidental omission of "too", found here in Q1.
- Similar considerations recommend Q1's "misbehaude" (1385) instead of Q2's "mishaude" (line 149). F1 has "mishaped and", F2 "mishaped and a" (followed by F3); F4 has "mishapen and a". Rowe and Capell read "mishav'd and a". But these conjectural patchings-up of the defective metre are not more likely to be correct than it is likely that the Q1 reporter(s) remembered the line accurately.
- 1386 "Thou frownst vpon thy Fate that smiles on thee". This line is peculiar to Q1. Cf. IV iii 4 (Q2 only), where Juliet says to the Nurse "For I haue need of many orysons, / To moue the heauens to smile vpon my state".

- 1389 Q1 "Chamber Window" Q2 "chamber". The Q1 variant entails a slight metrical irregularity. Cf. in the authentic text, II ii 2 and III v 41, where Juliet's chamber window is mentioned.
- 1393 "Comfort thy Mistresse": cf. the Friar's direction to Romeo a few lines earlier -- "hence and comfort her" (Q2 line 153, Q1 1389). In a later scene (III v) Juliet entreats the Nurse "comfort me, Counsaile me" (Q2 III v 218; see also *ibid.* 222, and Q1 1607). In a previous scene (II iv), where Romeo sends the Nurse to Juliet with directions, just as the Friar does here, he says to her "commend me to thy Mistresse" (Q2 only, II iv 166).
- 1395 "Good Lord what a thing learning is": this corresponds to Q2 line 166 "oh what learning is". Hoppe points out that this has been confused with The Taming of the Shrew, I ii 160, where Gremio says "O this learning, what a thing it is".
- 1397 Q1 "Well Sir" Q2 "My Lord". Q1 anticipates Q2 line 169, Q1 1401, where both texts have "sir".

Act III Scene iv.

- 1413 "Wife wher's your daughter,": a recollection of I iii 1 (Q1 line 236) -- "Nurse wher's my daughter?" -- with a change of speaker.

"is she in her chamber?": just before setting out for the Friar's cell to summon Romeo, the Nurse said to Juliet "Hie to your chamber" (III ii 141, Q2 only).

- 1415 Q1's "time to woee" corrects the "times to woee" of Q2 line 8, which is probably due to repetition from "times of wo".

- 1424 "For looke ye Sir," Q2 line 25 "For harke you,". Q1 contains a recollection of the third line of this scene: there Q2 has "Looke you" and Q1 (1411) "Looke yee Sir", where the "Sir" comes from the first line of the scene (Q1 1409).

- 1427 "and make no more adoe": a repetition of the first part of line 1423 "Wee'le make no great a doe" (Q2 line 24 "Well, keepe (sic) no great ado" -- clearly an error for "We'll keepe.....").

- 1431-3 "Wife goe you to your daughter, ere you goe to bed. Acquaint her with the County Paris loue,"

This corresponds in position with Q2 lines 32-3:

Go you to Iuliet ere you go to bed,  
Prepare her wife, against this wedding day.

But the Q1 version is actually a recollection of Q2 lines 15-16:

Wife go you to her ere you go to bed,  
Acquaint her here, of my sonne Paris loue,....

Act III Scene v.

- 1444 Q1 "And not the Nightingale" Q2 "No nightingale". Q1 contains a recollection of Q2 line 2 (Q1 1439) -- "and not the Larke".
- 1451 Note the Q1 inversion.
- 1453 Q1 "Then stay awhile" Q2 "Therefore stay yet". With Q1 cf. III iii 78 (Q2 only), where the Friar says to Romeo "stay a while".
- 1454 Q1 "Let me stay here, let me be tane, and dye" Q2 "Let me be tane, let me be put to death". With Q1 cf. lines 706-7 in that text, corresponding to II ii 177-8 of the authentic text: Juliet says "I haue forgot (Q2 misprints 'forget') why I did call thee backe", and Romeo answers in Q2 "Let me stand here till thou remember it" and in Q1 "Let me stay here till you remember it".
- 1455 Note the Q1 inversion.
- 1458-60 Q1 Ile say it is the Nightingale that beates  
The vaultie heauen so high aboue our heads,  
And not the Larke the Messenger of Morne.  
Q2 Nor that is not the Larke whose noates do beate  
The vaultie heauen so high aboue our heads,  
Q1 contains a recollection of the 2nd and 3rd lines of this scene -- "It was the Nightingale, and not the Larke, / That pierst....". The phrase "the Messenger of Morne" contains a double recollection:- (i) the 6th line of this scene, where the lark is called "the herald of the morn" in both Qq. (ii) II ii 29 (Q1 line 583) where Romeo talks of "a winged messenger of heauen".  
The sense of the Q2 version is superior to that of Q1; it is clear from the beginning of the scene that it is the bird's notes that "beate the vaultie heauen". Note how the defectively reported material in Q1 is nevertheless worked into metrical verse.
- 1462 Q1 "What sayes my Loue?" Q2 "How ist my soule?" With the Q1 version cf. II v 52 "tell me what sayes my loue?" -- Q1 line 986-7 "Tell me gentle Nurse, / What sayes my Loue?"  
  
"tis not yet day" Q2 "it is not day". With Q1 cf. the 1st line of the scene (both Qq.):-- "It is not yet nere (Q2 neare) day".
- 1463 Note the Q1 inversion.  
Q1 "flye hence" Q2 "hie hence". With Q1 cf. III iii 44



(Q1 1302), where Romeo says "I from this must flie". The imperative "fly hence" occurs at V iii 60 in the authentic text (spoken by Romeo to Paris), but this may be coincidence.

- 1469 Note the inversion at the beginning of this line (cf. Q2 line 32).
- 1477-9 These three lines represent Q2 lines 45-6; they labour the conceit, giving a very full explanation of it.
- 1487 ff. Q2 assigns this speech of Juliet's to Romeo.
- 1493-4 This material is misplaced in Q1; it reproduces, in slightly modified form, Q2 lines 40-1, where the Nurse's warning of Lady Capulet's approach has the effect of hastening Romeo's departure. Line 1493 and the first part of 1494 suggest that the Nurse is giving warning that it is time Romeo was gone; but he is gone, and it would seem that the reporter has adapted the lines by the addition of "make all sure" in a last-minute attempt to make the warning purely general.
- 1495-8 Q1 Enter Iuliets Mother. Nurse.  
Moth: Where are you Daughter?  
Nur: What Ladie, Lambe, what Iuliet?  
Iul: How now, who calls?  
Nur: It is your Mother.

Q2 Enter Mother.  
La. Ho daughter, are you vp?  
Iu. Who ist that calls? It is my lady Mother.

The Q1 reporter(s) have confused this passage with the opening of I iii:-

Enter Capulets Wife and Nurse.  
Wife. Nurse wher's my daughter? call her forth to me.  
Nurse. Now by my maidenhead, at twelue yeare old I bad her come, what Lamb, what Ladie-bird, God forbid, Wheres this Girle? what Iuliet.  
Enter Iuliet.  
Iuliet How now who calls?  
Nur. Your mother.

The confusion and its effects are quite obvious. It seems probable that this confusion is responsible for Q1 bringing on the Nurse here: in Q2 she enters later, after line 130, with Capulet (although there is no exit-direction for her after Q2 III v 41 it is clearly intended that she go off at that point).

One other small point should be noted: at 1496 Q1 has "What ladie, Lambe", while in I iii we have "what Lamb, what Ladie-bird": with the Q1 version cf. Q2 IV v 2, where the Nurse exclaims "Why Lambe, why Lady". At the point in Q1 corresponding to this (1822-3) we again find reminiscences of the beginning of I iii ("What lambe, what Lady birde?").

Note also that above 1493 appears the SD "Enter Nurse hastily" and above 1495 "Enter Iuliets Mother, Nurse". Between these two directions for the entry of the Nurse there is no exit-direction.

- 1509 "Content thee Girle": this phrase implies the omission of material corresponding to Q2 lines 87-91, where Juliet expresses herself equivocally so that her mother understands her to desire vengeance for Tybalt's death. Otherwise the phrase is quite pointless.

With "Girle" cf. Q2 line 109 of this scene and Q1 line 1519.

"if I could finde a man": an anticipation, with change of speaker, of Q2 line 101 (Juliet says "Madam if you could find out but a man.....").

- 1513 "Finde you the meanes, and Ile finde such a man". Q1 transfers this from Lady Capulet to Juliet, and the result is complete nonsense. The line appears in Q2 at line 108 (with "thou" in place of "you"). Thus Q1 misplaces it.
- 1515-6 Note how in this speech the Q1 punctuation spoils the sense. There should be a heavier mark after "behold him" and a lighter one (or none at all) after "my poore heart".
- 1514 "my heart shall nere be light": cf. IV ii 46 in Q2, where Capulet, rejoicing at Juliet's agreement to marry Paris, cries "My heart is wondrous light" (Q1 line 1770 -- "my heart is passing light").
- 1517 Q1 "ioyfull newes" Q2 "ioyfull tidings". With Q1 cf. V i 2 (Q2 only), where Romeo says "My dreames presage some ioyfull newes at hand".
- 1519 "Girle" Q2 "child": the Q1 reading is a recollection of line 109 in Q2 (cf. also Q1 1509).
- 1520 "one who pittying thy needfull state" Q2 "One who to put thee from thy heauines". With the Q1 version cf. the following:-  
i) III v 206-7 (Q1 1599-1600) "Is there no pittie sitting

(Q1 hanging) in the cloudes / That sees into the bottome of my greefe?"

ii) IV iii 3-5 (Q2 only) "For I haue need of many orysones, / To moue the heauens to smile vpon my state, / Which well thou knowest, is crosse and full of sin".

iii) III v 110 (Q1 1518), where Juliet speaks of her "needie (Q1 needfull) time".

Q1 1520 seems to be composed of fragments of lines in which Juliet bemoans her unhappiness, fused together into a line peculiar to itself.

1521 Q1 substitutes the commonplace phrase "found...out" for Q2's more unusual "sorted out".

Q1 "a happie day of ioy" Q2 "a sudden day of ioy". With the Q1 variant cf. "in happie time" two lines further on (Q2 only).

1524 Q1 "yong and youthfull Gentleman" Q2 "young, and Noble Gentleman". In the authentic text "youthful" occurs in a description of Paris at line 190 of this scene; and at IV ii 24 Juliet refers to him as "the youthfull Lord".

1526 "Early next Thursday morning" is taken from Q2 line 117 -- Q1 misplaces it -- and by the substitution of 'morning' for 'morne' (Q2) Q1 achieves regular metre.

"prouide": in view of the note on 1524 it may be interesting to refer here to Q2 lines 188-90: "...hauing now provided / A Gentleman of noble parentage, / Of faire demeanes, youthfull and nobly liand (sic)".

1529 Note the Q1 inversion.

1531 "here are newes indeed": Q1 misplaces this. In Q2 these words (with 'these' for 'here') come at the end of this speech (line 128).

1533-4 Q1 "And when I doo, it shalbe rather Romeo whom I hate, / Than Countie Paris that I cannot loue" Q2 "and when I do, I sweare / It shall be Romeo, whom you know I hate / Rather than Paris". By substituting "whom I hate" for "whom you know I hate" Q1 misses Juliet's equivocation. "That I cannot loue" is an anticipation: at Q2 line 195 of this scene (Q1 1586) Capulet, scornfully mimicing Juliet's refusal to marry Paris, puts into her mouth the denial "ile not wed, I cannot loue" (I quote from Q2).

1537 Q1 "a sea, a barke, a storme" Q2 "A Barke, a Sea, a Wind". With the Q1 variant cf. Q2 line 141 -- "Thy tempest tossed body". Cf. also III ii 66 (Q1 1228), where Juliet asks

"What storme is this that blowes so contrarie?" The  
 "storme" is the Nurse's lamentation.

- 1536-43 After the third line of this speech Q1 diverges from Q2 in phraseology, but keeps close to its purport. The first two lines obviously represent an attempt at reproducing material found in the 'good' text. It seems likely that, the reporter's memory failing, he has resorted to invention and conveyed something like the thought of his original in his own words.
- 1547-8 (Capo.) ....doth she not wexe proud? / Iul. Not proud ye haue, but thankfull that ye haue:". Obviously material necessary to the sense has been omitted before Iuliet's reply to Capulet: to make Q1 intelligible we must supply Q2 lines 147-9: "doth she not count her blest,/Vnworthy as she is, that we haue wrought/So worthy a Gentleman to be her Bride?".
- 1551-7 Note the differences of order between the two Qq. here.
- 1559 "resolue.....To goe...": cf. Q2 IV i 124-5 where the Friar tells Juliet to "be strong and prosperous in this resolue" (i.e. in her determination to counterfeit death in order to avoid marrying Paris).
- Q1 "on thursday next" Q2 "a Thursday". Q1 contains a recollection of Q2 lines 157-8 (Q1 1554-5): "But settle your fine Ioynts gainst Thursday next, / To go with Paris to Saint Peters Church". This last line is exactly repeated at Q1 1560.
- 1567 Q1 misplaces "my Lord".
- 1572 Q1 is right in giving the exclamation "Oh goddegodden" to Capulet. Q2 gibes it to the Nurse:  
Nur. I speake no treason,  
 Father, o Godigeden,  
 May not one speake? (Q2 lines 178-80).  
 Clearly the assignation in front of line 179 has slipped into the text itself: Q4 makes the obvious correction "Fa. O Godigeden". (F1 follows Q3 which reproduces Q2 here; F2 removes "Father" but keeps the rest of line 179 embedded in the Nurse's speech).
- 1584-5 Q1 inverts the order of "whining" and "puling".
- 1588 Q1 "cannot wedde" Q2 "will not wed": Q1 contains a recollection of "I cannot loue" in the previous line in Q1 (Q2 line 195).



- 1592 "bethinke your selfe": this anticipates Q2 line 205 -- "bethinke you".
- 1598 "Thinke ont, looke toot, I doe not vse to iest": this corresponds in position to Q2 line 205 "Trust too't, be-thinke you, ile not be forsworne". In place of this Q1 reproduces, with an inversion, the line found in Q2 at line 199 -- "Looke too't, thinke on't, I do not vse to iest".
- 1599 Q1 "Is there no pittie hanging in the cloudes," Q2 "Is there no pittie sitting in the cloudes". With Q1 cf. I iv 98-9 (Q1 lines 387-8), where Romeo says "my mind misgiues, / Some consequence yet hanging in the starres,..." (Q1 "is hanging").
- 1600 Q1 "That lookes into the bottom of my woes" Q2 "That sees into the bottome of my greefe". With Q1 cf. III ii 129 (Q2 only) where Juliet, speaking of Romeo's banishment, says "no words can that woe sound", and V iii 188-9 (Q2) where the Watchman says "But the true ground of all these piteous woes / We cannot without circumstance descry".
- 1601 Q1 "I doe beseech you Madame," Q2 "O sweet my Mother". With Q1 cf. line 163 above (Q2 only) "Good Father, I beseech you".
- 1607-8 Q1 "Ah Nurse what comfort? what counsell canst thou giue me". Cf. Q2, in the corresponding speech, "comfort me, counsaile me" (line 218) and "Some comfort Nurse" (line 222). Cf. also IV i 62 (Q1 1686), where Juliet says to the Friar "Giue me some present (Q1 sudden) counsell".
- 1609 Q1's "I know not what to say" is peculiar to that text. The phrase appears in Q2 at IV v 132, where the 3rd Musician says, in answer to Peter's riddle, "Faith I know not what to say". I doubt whether this is more than coincidence. however.
- 1613 Q1 "Oh he is a gallant Gentleman" Q2 "O hees a louely Gentleman" (the reference is to Paris). With Q1 cf. line 118 of the Q2 version of this scene -- "The gallant, young, and Noble Gentleman, / The Countie Paris".
- 1622 Q1 "thou hast comforted me wondrous much" Q2 "thou hast comforted me maruellous much". With the Q1 variant cf. IV ii 46 (Q2) where Capulet says "My heart is wondrous light" (Q1 1770 'passing light').
- 1623-4 Q1 "goe thy waies vnto my mother / Tell her..." Q2 "Go in, and tell my Lady....". At line 279 in Q1 the Nurse



says to Juliet "VWell goe thy waies,..."; in the 'good' text she uses the phrase at II v 42.

Act IV Scene i.

- 1636 Q1 "say ye:" Q2 "sir". With Q1 cf. Q2 line 4 (Q1 1639):- "You say you do not know.....".
- 1638 Q1 inverts the positions of 'slacke' and 'slow'.
- 1642 Q1's "talkt" is right; Q2 misprints "talke" (corrected in Q5).
- 1644 Q1 substitutes the more common word "thinkes" for Q2's "counts" (line 9).
- 1652 Above this line Q1 has the erroneous stage-direction "Enter Paris" (for Juliet).
- 1669 Q1 "wrong" Q2 "slaughter". Q1 owes its reading to the preceding line ("Thou wrongst it more than teares by that report"): the variant destroys the metre.
- 1678 This line is made up of elements from two lines in Q2 (43-4).
- 1680 Q1 "that am past cure, past help" Q2 "past hope, past care, past help". Despite the beauty of Q2's "care" it is suspect as a possible misreading of "cure", especially as at IV v 68-9 Q2 has "confusions care liues not, /In these confusions", where Theobald was clearly correct in emending "care" to "cure".
- 1684 Q1 "it" Q2 "this": the Q1 variant may be a compositor's visual error; cf. 'it' at the end of the next line.
- 1686 Q1 "Giue me some sudden counsell" Q2 "Giue me some present counsell". Cf. III iii 47 (Q1 line 1304) where the same variation occurs the other way round:- Q1 "no present meane of death" Q2 "no sudden meane of death". Apparently the reporter has confused the two passages.
- 1691 Q1 "Speake not, be briefe: for I desire to die," Q2 "Be not so long to speake, I long to die,". Q1 misses the pun; in addition it impairs the sense of the line by reading "speake not", followed immediately by "be briefe": "speake not" is doubtless an anticipation of the next line, where we have "speake not of remedie" which, of course, makes excellent sense.  
With 1691 cf. also Q2 V iii 177 where Juliet says "Yea noise? then Ile be briefe. O happy dagger..... let me dye":

note that just before the line under discussion Juliet has been talking of using 'this bloodie Knife' (Q1 1687); this forms a link between the two passages.

- 1700 Q1's "flye from blame" (cf. Q2 "scape from it") was probably suggested by the rhyme "shame" at the end of the preceding line.
- 1703 Editorial opinion is divided between 'yonder tower' (Q1) and 'any Tower' (Q2).
- 1702-8 White contended that this passage was re-written by Shakespeare into the version found in Q2 (lines 80-6): I believe that on the contrary it is based on the Q2 version itself, and that a versifying reporter or hack-poet has worked an imperfect reconstruction of that text into a metrical passage of his own.
- 1704 The "steepie mountaines top" may not inconceivably have been suggested by a stray recollection of the "mystie Mountaine tops" of III v 10 (Q1 line 1447).
- 1708 "Or lay me in tombe with one new dead" (obviously "a" has been accidentally omitted before "tombe"): this stands in place of Q2 lines 85-6: "Or bid me go into a new made graue,/And hide me with a dead man in his," (sic: Q4 supplies 'shroud' after 'his'). With the Q1 line cf. the following passages from the authentic text:  
 IV iii 30 "How if when I am laid into the Tombe,/I wake before...."  
 V ii 30 "Poore liuing Coarse, closde in a dead mans Tombe"  
 V iii 183-4 "And Iuliet bleeding, warme, and newlie dead:/  
Who here hath laine this two daies buried".  
 Possibly Q1 1708 combines fragments ("lay -- tombe -- new dead") from three separate but associated passages.
- 1709 Q1 "Things that to heare them namde haue made me tremble"  
 Q2 "Things that to heare them told, haue made me tremble"  
 With Q1 cf. III v 104-5 (Q2 only) -- "O how my heart abhors/  
 To heare him namde and cannot come to him". That the original sense is quite lost sight of is not necessarily an argument against the existence of a 'recollection'.
- 1711 Q1 "a faithfull vnstaind VVife" Q2 "an vnstaind wife".  
 With Q1 cf. V iii 240 (Q2 only): "Romeos faithfull wife".
- 1713 Q1 "Hold Iuliet, hie thee home, get thee to bed," Q2 "Hold then, go home, be merrie, giue consent,/To marrie Paris:"  
 In Q2 'Hie you' occurs, as a direction to Juliet, at II v 67 (Q1 1012) 71 and 76; cf. also III ii 141.

With 1713 cf. also IV iii 14 (Q2 only), where Lady Capulet says to Juliet "Get thee to bed".

- 1716 Q1 "distilled Liquor" is doubtless correct, Q2's "distilling" an error. Similarly at 1721 Q1 ("breath") corrects the erroneous "breast" at Q2 line 99.
- 1717-21 The Q1 versifier can be seen here, patching up remembered fragments with his own invention and achieving a metrical passage.
- 1724 Q1 combines elements from Q2 lines 108 and 112 in this line.
- Q1 "Kindreds Vault": cf. in Q2 (i) the corresponding phrase "kindreds graue" (line 112) (ii) "that same auncient vault, /Where all the kindred of the Capulets lie" (lines 113-4). Cf. also Q2 V iii 262, where the Friar says that he came "to take her from her kindreds Vault".
- 1725 "Ile send in hast to Mantua to thy Lord,": cf. Q2, lines 125-6 of this scene: "Ile send a Frier with speed/To Mantua with my Letters to thy Lord".
- 1726 "And he shall come and take thee from thy graue": cf. in Q2, V iii 254-6 where the Friar relates that he "writ to Romeo/That he should hither come..../To help to take her from her borrowed graue". At the corresponding point Q1 has "That he might come and take her from the Toombe" (line 2170).
- 1727 "be sure thou send for my deare Romeo": this is peculiar to Q1. Cf. in Q2, V iii 264, where the Friar relates his intention to take the awakened Juliet back to his cell "Till I conueniently could send to Romeo".

Act IV Scene ii.

- 1728 In the SD above this line Q1 directs the entry of only one servant; cf. Q2's "Serving men, two or three". In this Q1 may preserve a trace of abridgment.
- 1730 Q1 "prouide me" Q2 "go hire me". The hiring of the cooks is part of the preparations for the wedding celebrations; speaking of the preparations as a whole Lady Capulet says at lines 37-8 of the Q2 version of this scene "We shall be short in our prouision, / Tis now neare night" (cf. Q1 1768).
- 1731 "Let me alone for that": this is an anticipation. At line 42 of the Q2 version Capulet says "let me alone": for this Q1 substitutes the colloquial phrase "Let me alone for that" (thus changing the meaning) (line 1769). This is anticipated at 1731.
- 1737 "wheres this Head-strong?" 'Head-strong' is an anticipation of Q2 line 15 (cf. Q1 1743).
- 1738-9 "Shees gone (my Lord) to Frier Laurence Cell / To be confessed": this corresponds to Q2 lines 10-11 (spoken by Capulet) "What is my daughter gone to Frier Lawrence?" With the Q1 version cf. III v 241-3 (Q1 1624-6) where Juliet asks the Nurse to tell her mother that "I am gone.....to Laurence Cell,/To make confession". Cf. also the phrase "Frier Laurence cell" at II iv 155 and II v 67 (Q1 lines 968 and 1012).
- 1742 Q1 "from Confession" Q2 "from shrift": cf. Q1 1739.
- 1750-4 Q1 makes a transposition here: lines 30-1 of the Q2 version are reproduced (with an inversion of "reuerend" and "holy" and with the variation "vnto" for "to him") at 1751-2: and Q2 lines 22-3 are imperfectly reproduced at 1753-4.  
1750: "Why thats well said" corresponds to Q2 line 27  
"this is well": note the change of speaker (Q1 Lady Capulet, Q2 Capulet).
- 1757 "Against to morrow": cf. Q2 line 46 of this scene.
- 1759 Q1 "Helpe her to sort....": this corresponds to Q2 line 41 "helpe to decke vp her"; this last is confused in Q1 with Q2 line 33 of this scene -- "go....to helpe me sort...". (Cf. Q1 line 1756.)



1758 "good Nurse goe in with her" (Lady Capulet) is based on Q2 line 32, where Juliet says "Nurse will you go with me into my closet" (cf. Q1 1755).

1761 "sweet hart": the Nurse uses this form of address to Juliet in Q2 at IV v 3.

1763 and 1768: misplaced and imperfect reproductions of Q2 lines 35 and 37 respectively.

Act IV Scene iii.

- 1774 "For I do meane to lye alone to night", and 1778 "I desire to lye alone": the latter corresponds to Q2 line 9 "let me now be left alone". But both are indebted to a recollection of Q2 IV i 92, where the Friar says to Juliet "To morrow night looke that thou lie alone".
- 1780 "be atirring Iuliet": an anticipation of Q2 IV iv 3, where Capulet cries "Come, stir, stir, stir, ....".
- 1781 "The Countie will be earlie here to morrow": cf. Q2 IV iv 22 -- "The Countie will be here with musicke straight": this is found in Q1 at line 1820. With 1781 cf. also III v 117 (Q1 1526) where Capulet tells Juliet that Paris is to marry her "early next Thursday morne", and IV i 42 (Q2 only) where Paris says to her "on Thursday early will I rowse yee".
- 1784 "Ah, I doo take a fearfull thing in hand": cf. Q2 line 32 -- "there's a fearfull poynt".
- 1785 "Potion". Q2 has "mixture" (line 21). Q2 has "potion" at V iii 252 and 257 (cf. also Q1 2167).
- 1786 "Must I of force be married to the Countie?" This contains an anticipation of Q2 V iii 246-7, where the Friar says "you.....would haue married her perforce/To Countie Paris".
- 1793 Q1 "What if I should be stifled in the Toomb?" At the corresponding point Q2 has "How if...." (line 30): the opening of the Q1 line contains a recollection of Q2 line 24 "What if it be a poyson..." (cf. Q1 line 1788). Corresponding to "stifled in the Toomb" Q2 has "stiffled in the Vault": with the Q1 variant cf. Q2 line 30 "How if when I am laid into the Tombe....". In this single line Q1 combines elements from Q2 lines 30 and 33, thus neatly compressing Q2 30-3 into one line.
- 1796 Q1 "with my dead forefathers bones" (Q2 "...my forefathers ioynts"). With Q1 cf. Q2 lines 40-1 of this scene ("Where ....the bones /Of all my buried ancestors are packt").
- 1798 "Tybalt weltering in his bloud": the picture is the same as that drawn by the Nurse in Q2 at III ii 57-8, where she describes Tybalt's corpse to Juliet as "all bedawbde in bloud, / All in goare bloud".

Act IV Scene iv.

- 1801 "Thats well said Nurse, set all in redines:" Here we have repeated two separate phrases found earlier in Q1; cf. (i) line 1750 -- "Why thats well said" (speaker, Lady Capulet); (ii) line 1392 -- "Nurse prouide all things in a readines" (speaker, Friar Laurence).
- 1802 "The Countie will be heere immediatly": an inexact anticipation of Q2 line 22 (Q1 1820) -- "The Countie will be heere with musicke straight". See also note on 1781.
- 1803 "Make hast, make hast": cf. Q2 line 27 of this scene (note also do. line 16).  
 "for it is almost day": cf. Q2 line 21 of this scene -- "good father (sic) tis day".
- 1808-9 The appositeness of this rejoinder is lessened by Q1's omission of "for this nights watching" (Q2 line 9) after "you will be sicke.....". Yet the Q1 sequence is in itself intelligible; this cannot be said of lines 1810-1.
- 1811 In the S.D. above this line Q1 directs the entry of only one servant; in Q2 we find "Enter three or foure.....". Possibly Q1 here represents an abridgment.
- In line 1810 Lady Capulet says that her husband has in his time been a 'mouse-hunt', i.e. an animal of the weasel tribe: it is a sly reference to the nocturnal pursuits of a young rake. Capulet's "A Ielous hood" in line 1811 is properly intelligible only if after 1810 we supply Q2 line 13 -- "But I will watch you from such watching now".
- 1814 To the proper name "Will" in this line corresponds "Peter" in Q2 (line 17). There is no reason to suppose that the Q1 name refers to Will Kemp, whom we know to have taken the part of Peter (see the S.D. above Q2 IV v 103). In a badly reported scene one common Christian name has been substituted for another.
- 1816 With the servant's "Nay I warrant let me alone" cf. Q1 line 1731, where the servant likewise says "I warrant you Sir, let me alone for that".
- 1819 "call vp your daughter": 1821 "Nurse call vp my daughter": Cf. I iii 1 (both Qq.) -- "Nurse wher's my daughter? call her forth to me": cf. also III v 66-7 (Q2) -- "La. Ho daughter, are you vp? / Iu. Who ist that calls?"

Act IV Scene v.

- 1822-3 "What lambe, what Lady Birde? fast I warrant. What Iuliet?"  
 1826-7 "What lambe I say, fast still: what Lady, Loue, what bride, what Iuliet".  
 With these passages cf. (i) Q2 lines 1-3 of this scene:-  
 "Mistris, what mistris, Iuliet, fast I warrant her she,  
 Why Lambe, why Lady, fie you sluggabed,  
 Why Loue I say, Madam, sweete heart, why Bride:" and (ii) I iii 3-4 (Q1 lines 239-40): "what Lamb, what Ladie-bird...  
 ... what Iuliet". Fragments of these two passages are intricately interwoven in Q1 here.  
 Cf. also note on Q1 lines 1495-8.
- 1823-4 "well, let the County take you in your bed": anticipation of Q2 line 10.  
 "yee sleepe for a weeke now,": a conflation of two phrases in Q2, viz. (a) "you take your penniworths now" (b) Sleepe for a weeke" (lines 4-5).
- 1827-8 "Nay then I see I must wake you indeed": this corresponds to Q2 line 13 "I must needs wake you". With the Q1 construction cf. in the authentic text I iv 55 "O then I see Queene Mab hath bin with you:" III iii 63 "O then I see that mad men haue no eares", III v 171 "But now I see this one is one too much".
- 1829-30 "alack the day": an anticipation of Q2 line 26, with change of speaker.  
 Q2 line 26 is anticipated in its entirety at Q1 1832, with the same change of speaker (Q2 Lady Capulet Q1 Nurse).
- 1833 "Accurst, vnhappy, miserable time": cf. Q2 line 33 "O wo-  
 full time!" and lines 46-7 "Accurst, vnhappy, wretched  
 hatefull day, / Most miserable houre that ere time saw...".
- 1834 "Come, come, make hast, wheres my daughter?" Cf. Q1 1819  
 where Capulet exclaims "Come, come, make hast call vp your  
 daughter". "Make hast" is found in Q2 at line 27 of IV iv;  
 "wheres my daughter" is a recollection of I iii 1 with a  
 transference of the words from one parent to the other.
- 1836 "all pale and wan": in the authentic text "pale" is used  
 of corpses at III ii 57 and V iii 152.
- 1837 "Accursed time": cf. Q2 line 33 "O wo-  
 full time" and line 46 "Accurst.....day".



# The Lamentations over Juliet.

Lines 1838-79 constitute one of the most discussed passages in Q1. The relationship they bear to the corresponding lines in Q2 (IV iv 36-98) is a crucial problem.

Amongst critics who hold that Q1 here represents a version earlier than that given in Q2 there is disagreement as to whether the Q1 version is wholly Shakespearian. Grant White expressed the opinion that after line 1844 "Q1 has a passage which requires higher authority than that of such a publication to cause it to be received as Shakespeare's" (see Furness, Variorum, p. 244). White singles out lines 1850-1, 1854-5, 1864-70 as lines which "cannot be accepted as the fruits even of Shakespeare's earliest dramatic years" (ibid pp. 419-20). Fleay (article in Macmillan's Magazine, July 1877, pp. 195 ff.) argued that the style of lines 1856-70 "is no-where used by Shakespeare, and is utterly discordant with the genius of his dramatic writings". F. G. Hubbard (Univ. of Wisconsin Studies in Lang. and Lit. No.19 p.25) says of lines 1831-70 that "this whole passage of lamentation is the most noticeable piece of antique writing in the whole play"; it is one of the passages in Q1 "the simplest and most reasonable explanation" of which is that they are "portions of the old play upon which the Shakespearian version of Q1 is founded" (ibid p. 22). Hubbard cites several parallels between lines in this passage and lines in older plays as proof of the "antique" style and diction of the former. On the other hand, T. A. Spalding (Transac. New Shak. Soc., 1877-9, Pt. I, pp.79 ff.), arguing against Fleay's contention that a non-Shakespearian hand is discernible in Q1, maintained that the whole passage under discussion is a reported version of a Shakespearian first draft. He makes much of the argument that the lamentations in Q1 were "probably intended to be a comic satire" as is also the version in Q2: "this probably comic scene" in Q1 "bears a slight resemblance to the peculiarities of some of Shakespeare's predecessors... It therefore represents a piece of satire on those peculiarities: but it is impossible to say exactly upon what passage it is a satire, as we only possess the note-taker's version of what is a very animated and complicated dialogue which probably wanted a good deal of touching up before it went to press" (op. cit. p. 81). There is therefore an explanation for the parallels noted by Hubbard other than that which he himself advances.

It would appear that Spalding agreed with Mommsen in positing a reviser of the reporter's notes, who worked these into shape for the press. Mommsen's own theory would attribute all the material peculiar to Q1 to the literary



hack, filling in gaps in the notes by his own invention (see Athenaeum, 1857, p.182 and Romeo und Julia 1859, Prolegomena pp. 161-2). Here again it is possible to explain the parallels which Hubbard notes between this passage in Q1 and older plays, by supposing that this literary hack was himself addicted to the "antique" style, or that he was very familiar with the older plays in question, or even that he remembered that the lamentations in his original were a satirical imitation of that style and fashioned his own version accordingly, even out-Heroding Herod.

Recently H. R. Hoppe has suggested that in Q1 Romeo we have to deal with a reporter who had acted in an abridgement, who could himself write verse, and who attempted to reproduce the full version, having some slight knowledge of passages which had been cut in the abridgement (see R.E.S. July 1938, pp.271 ff.: the passage with which we are occupied is discussed on pp. 280-3). Hoppe points out that lines 1838-40 and 1844 are substantially correct: we notice, then, that in Capulet's speech (1839-43) the first two lines are absolutely accurate, and that from there the speech deteriorates into awkwardly constructed summary; similarly in Paris' speech (1844-51) the first line is absolutely accurate, while the remainder is foreign to Q2. Hoppe argues that in a very drastic abridgement all the material necessary between the discovery of Juliet's "corpse" and the episode of the Musicians is (a) Q2 line 36, Q1 1838, (b) the beginning of Capulet's reply (I would say Q2 lines 37 to "with thy wife" in 39, Q1 1839-41 up to "with thy bride") and (c) the first line of Paris' speech (Q2 line 44, Q1 1844: we may suppose that in an abridgement the Friar's interposition, Q2 line 68, Q1 1871, might interrupt Paris after this single line). That is to say, Hoppe argues that the lines which are accurately reproduced in Q1 are all that would be necessary "if an adapter did wish to cut this episode to the bone". It is very reasonable indeed to suggest that a "reporter turned versifier" might fill in the cuts as best he could, using invention where memory failed completely. When it is remembered, moreover, that in the first section of the Introduction we found distinct indications that material peculiar to Q1 was the work of some such person and certainly never stood in any Romeo play, the reasonableness of Hoppe's explanation of the lamentations in Q1 is re-emphasised. And as for Hubbard's parallels, Hoppe suggests that the reporter-versifier "was merely rephrasing image-patterns surviving from his participation in other plays" (op. cit. p. 280).

- 1838 Q1 assigns this line to Paris, Q2 to the Friar. Staunton thought that at this point the Friar "is too critically placed to be anxious to lead the conversation. Moreover, the answer of Capulet tends to show that Paris had asked

the question". But it is unnecessary to suppose that the first two lines of Capulet's speech (Q2 37,8: Q1 1839,40) are addressed to the same person. It is quite possible that after replying to the Friar's question Capulet turns to Paris and addresses him -- "O sonne etc."

- 1841 Q1 "bride" Q2 "wife". The Q1 variant is a recollection: cf. Q2 line 36 (Q1 1838).

Q1 "flower as she is," Q2 "Flower as she was". By altering the tense Q1 loses the point of the conceit.

- 1843 The reporter has not fully understood the conceit in lines 41-3 of the Q2 version of this scene. By dying, Capulet will be giving his life to Death, his heir because his son-in-law.

- 1844 Q1's "long" is correct; Q2 misprints "loue" (line 44).

- 1846 Q1 takes the epithets here from Q2 lines 46-7, applying them to 'man' instead of 'day' or 'houre': (cf. 1837 -- "Accursed time, vnfortunate olde man"). The same epithets as in 1846 are also anticipated at 1833 (qualifying the noun 'time'). Hubbard compares with 1846 this line from Cornelia -- "O miserable, desolate, distressful wretch" ('distrest' occurs in Q1 at 1849 and 1866).

- 1849 "Distrest": this adjective is found in Q2 at line 62 of this scene.

- 1851 "To liue so vile, so wretched as I shall": this may contain a vague recollection of words at II iii 17 "For nought so vile, that on the earth doth liue,.....": cf. Q1 line 737. The line is spoken by the Friar. That the context is totally altered does not necessarily mean that the words were not in the reporter-versifier's mind.

- 1852 "O heere she lies that was our hope, our ioy": possibly the reporter-versifier has combined into a line of his own vague recollections of two passages in the authentic text of the play: (1) lines 66-7 of the Q2 version of this scene -- "Dead art thou, alacke my child is dead, /And with my child my ioyes are buried", (2) I ii 14, where Capulet says that "Earth hath swallowed all my hopes but she, / Shees the hopefull Lady of my earth".

- 1853 "And being dead, dead sorrow nips vs all"; Hubbard compares Spanish Tragedy I i 12-3 "But in the harvest of my summer joys / Death's winter nipped the blossoms of my bliss". Cf. also Titus Andronicus IV iv 70 "These tidings nip me, and

I hang the head/As flowers with frost".

- 1856-70 There is a great amount of repetition here: line 1856 is exactly repeated at 1860; "vniust" and "impartiall" are repeated a third time in 1863; "destinie" (sing.) is repeated a third time in 1865, and a fourth in 1868. "Depriude" occurs twice -- in 1859 and 1865. "My hope" and "my ioy" (line 1858) have already appeared in 1852.

There are other close parallels within the passage. Each of the three speeches contains a rhetorical "why" exclamation: compare:-

- (a) Why to this day haue you preseru'de my life?/To see...
- (b) Why this sad time haue I desird to see....
- (c) why should I liue / To see.....

Cf. also the following parallelism between the 2nd and 3rd speeches:-

- (b) This day, this vniust, this impartiall day...
- (c) this day, this miserable day....

Hoppe (op. cit. p. 291) speaks of Q1 having "repetitions of its own, spun spiderlike from itself": he implies that the repetitions suggest paucity of inventive power. But Staunton would have argued that the repetitions and parallelism were intentional; and even if we agree with Hoppe that the Q1 passage is to be attributed to a reporter turned versifier it is just possible that they are intentional.

- 1861 "O sad fac'd sorrow map of misery": Hubbard compares Spanish Tragedy III 1091 -- "My sorrow's map", Selimus 182 -- "A map of many valours", and Lochrine V iv 139 -- "Lochrine, the map of magnanimity".

The five-line speech which begins with this line is assigned to Capulet in Q1: but the preceding speech has just been delivered by that character. It seems reasonable to suppose that the assignation in front of 1861 should be to Paris: "This day....Wherein I hop'd to see my comfort full" seems most obviously to refer to the fact that this was to have been Paris's wedding-day. But Spalding argues very plausibly that the speech should go to the Nurse: he points out that Paris has already had his say (lines 1844-51), that the Nurse is "hardly the character to content herself with a merely silent demonstration of affliction" (cf. the S.D. after 1879), and that if the speakers of the three speeches (lines 1856-70) are Capulet, his wife, and the Nurse then "all the speakers in the portion in question may be looked upon as comic characters": he uses this last point to support his view that the style of the lamentations in Q1 is deliberately satirical. His strongest point in favour of assigning 1861-5 to the Nurse is the appropriateness to her of the words "why this sad time haue I desird to see" and "this day...wherein I hoped to see my comfort full": he



says that the Nurse "takes the interest of a foster-mother in Juliet, and the only joy that her limited vision can descry for her is that of marriage. She tells her: 'Might I but live to see thee married once, I have my wish', I iii 61. The day was evidently one on which she expected to see her 'comfort full'." (See Transac. New Shak. Soc., 1877-9 Pt. I p. 81). While leaving the question of Paris versus the Nurse open, I must say that I find Spalding almost completely convincing. His alternative suggestion is much less probable -- that the two speeches assigned to Capulet constitute only one, or that a line assigned to someone else between them has accidentally dropped out. For the parallelism of three five-line speeches in the same vein by different speakers seems deliberate.

- 1868-9 "Alacke the time that euer I was borne./To be partaker of this destinie,": cf. in Q2, IV v 15, where the Nurse exclaims "O wereaday that euer I was borne".
- 1870 "Alacke the day" occurs in the Q2 version of this scene at line 26; with "welladay" cf. "wereaday", Q2 line 15.
- 1871 "O peace for shame, if not for charity": at line 68 Q2 has simply "Peace ho for shame". The Q1 line is a quotation from Richard III, I iii 273, as Hoppe points out. Apart from the substitution of "O peace" for "Peace, peace" the quotation is exact.
- 1872 "Your daughter liues in peace and happiness": probably there is here an anticipation of Q2 V i 19 -- "And her immortall part with Angels liues".
- 1875 "And as the custome of our Country is,": at line 83 Q2 has simply "and as the custome is". In Q1 this is confused with Q2 IV i 110 -- "Then as the manner of our countrie is,...." (also in a speech by the Friar).
- 1876-7 "In all her best and sumptuous ornaments,/Conuay her where her Ancestors lie tomb'd": Q2 line 84 "in her best array beare her to Church:".
- (i) With Q1 cf. Q2 IV ii 33-4, where Juliet asks the Nurse to help her sort out "such needfull ornaments,/ As you thinke fit to furnish me to morrow". 1876 probably contains a recollection of this.
  - (ii) The Q1 direction to carry Juliet to where her ancestors lie tombed, instead of to church, is the result of a confusion with Q2 IV i 110-4.
  - (iii) With the words "where her ancestors lie tomb'd" cf. Q2 IV iii 39-41 -- "a Vaulte, an auncient receptacle,/ Where for this many hundred yeares the bones/Of all my buried ancestors are packt". 1877 probably contains a recollection of this.

- 1880 Q1 "wofull case" Q2 "pitifull case". The Q1 variant is probably due to a recollection of "wofull" in the lamentations above: cf. Q2 lines 33, 52, 57 of this scene.
- 1890 "we will note you": Q1 completely misses the point of the repartee; cf. Q2 lines 117-19.
- 1892 The minstrels' names are confused: with Q1's Simon sound Pot cf. Q2 Simon Catling and Iames sound post (lines 127 and 131).  
In line 1899 Q1 has the name "Mathew minikine", not found in Q2. And Q1 has no mention of the name "Hugh Rebick", found in Q2 in line 129.
- 1895 "And dolefull dumps the minde oppresse:" This line was first adopted into the authentic text by Capell. It is omitted in Q2.



Act V Scene i.

- 1908 Q1 "the flattering Eye of Sleepe" Q2 "the flattering truth of sleepe". These two readings have aroused a mass of critical comment: see Furness, Variorum, pp. 255-8. Both have been assailed as incomprehensible. Of the emendations of the Q2 version which have been suggested, that of Collier, "the flattering death of sleep" is ridiculous; that of Singer, "the flattering soother sleep", much better; but that of White, "the flattering sooth of sleep", distinctly the best. But no emendation is necessary; nor should an editor adopt the reading of Q1, as Malone did. There is no reason to suspect Q2 of corruption here. In the first place its reading is corroborated by the fact that it is anticipated in Q1 at lines 679-81, where Romeo says "I feare being night,/All this is but a dream I heare and see,/Too flattering true to be substantiall" (cf. Q2 II ii 145 "flattering sweete"). In the second place the Q2 reading is perfectly comprehensible, as a sort of oxymoron: I think Ulrici hit the mark, paraphrasing the passage thus: "If I dare trust the truth which one is wont to impute to dreams, but which is only the truth of a flattery, therefore unsafe, untrustworthy, then my dreams presage, &c." At line 1908 the Q1 reporter substitutes a different idea, which is also comprehensible: the "eye of sleep" is that which sees visions, and these flatter and do not merit unreserved credence.
- 1909 Q1 "My Dreame presagde some good euent to come" Q2 "My dreames presage some ioyfull newes at hand". The reporter may have had at the back of his mind some such passage as I Henry VI IV i 191 -- "It doth presage some ill event".
- 1910 Q1 "chearfull" Q2 "lightly". Q1 anticipates Q2 line 5, where Romeo talks of his "chearfull thoughts".
- 1912 "Methought I was this night alreadie dead": when in memorial reconstructions words and phrases are 'anticipated' or 'recollected' they are not always transferred to similar contexts. Here I suggest a 'recollection of Q2 II iv 13 -- "Alas poore Romeo, he is alreadie dead....." (cf. Q1 line 827).
- 1914 This line is indebted to Q2 line 6 (i.e. the line for which Q1 1912 is substituted).
- 1919 Q1 "How fares my Juliet?" Q2 "How doth my Lady Iuliet?" (line 15). I agree with White, who says that "'How doth my lady Juliet' would clearly seem an accidental repetition

of the question in the line immediately above it; even if it did not add two entirely superfluous syllables to the verse" (Furness p.259). Delius thought that "a repetition of the question, almost word for word, is the more admissible here, since Romeo immediately adds, 'That I ask again'" (do.): but this is surely over-literal. If Q2 is corrupt, the error may be a visual one -- the eye of the transcriber or compositor catching once again the first four words of the preceding line: or the transcriber, reading "that I aske againe" quite literally may have introduced a "correction" of his own.

1920 Note Q1's inversion; it is paralleled in the next line.

1923 Q1 "dwell" Q2 "liues". Not inconceivably the reporter had in mind Q2 line 40 -- "hereabouts a dwells" (cf. Q1 line 1945).

1924 Q1 "such bad tidings" Q2 "these ill newes". Q1 probably anticipates Q2 V iii 294 -- "the tidings of her death".

1925 Q1 "euen" is a monosyllable. The Q2 "in" (line 24) is highly interesting as a possible aural error for "e'en"; it is not beyond belief that the transcriber wrote to dictation here.

Q1 "I defie my Starres" Q2 "I denie you starres". There is a good deal to be said in favour of the Q1 version here. The stars have decreed infelicity for Romeo; he will defy them by embracing death and union with Juliet in the grave: White points out that the Q1 version is upheld by Romeo's subsequent words at V iii 113 ff. of the accepted text -- "O, here / Will I.....shake the yoke of inauspicious starres, / From this world wearied flesh" (see Furness, p.259). "Denie" is probably a simple misprint: the best reading is probably "I defy you, stars".

1928 "Pardon me Sir" is repeated from line 1924, where the phrase is derived from Q2 line 22 "O pardon me...".

"I will not leaue you thus": (repeated, with 'yet' for 'thus', at 1930): probably the reporter had Romeo's "Leaue me" in mind (Q2 line 31 of this scene). Cf. also Q2 I i 194, where Benvolio says "And if you leaue me so, you do me wrong".

In the corresponding passage in Q2 (V i 27-9) Romeo's servant does not express any refusal to go; he merely exhorts his master to "haue patience". Possibly the Q1 reporter has confused this point in the play with V iii 43-4 (cf. Q1 line 2027). To this confusion we might attribute the reading of Q1 1929 -- "Your lookes are dangerous and full of

feare" (Q2 line 28 "...pale and wilde"): cf. Q2 V iii 44 "His lookes I feare".

- 1930 "I dare not.....leauē you....": cf. Q2 V iii 138 (Q1 2086) where, in answer to the Friar's request that he accompany him to the vault, Romeo's servant says "I dare not sir", and Q2 V iii 167 (Q1 2107) where the Friar says to the newly awakened Juliet "I dare no longer (Q1 not) stay".
- 1932 "And hyre those horse": this is derived from Q2 line 35. But a confusion has arisen with Q2 lines 25-6 (cf. 26 -- "And hire post horses"), so that at the end of 1931 Q1 repeats "get me incke and paper" from Q2 25 (cf. Q1 line 1926, which corresponds to Q2 lines 25-6).
- Q1 "stay not I say": possibly an anticipation of Romeo's warning to Paris at Q2 V iii 66 -- "stay not, begone...".
- 1936-7 "whose needie shop is stufft/With .....empty boxes": obviously we are dealing with a very vague memory of the Q2 version of the speech; the word "stuffed" was remembered, but not its setting ("An allegater stufft, and other skins", Q2 line 45), and it was used in another sense altogether.
- 1938 "Aligarta": the reporter evidently did not know the word but remembered the sound.
- 1939 "old" is misplaced (cf. Q2 line 49).
- 1940 Q1 "strewed" Q2 (line 50) "scattered". The verb "strew" occurs four times in the received text of V iii, viz. at lines 12, 17, 36, and 281.
- 1941 Q1 "I thought" Q2 (line 51) "I said". Q1 anticipates Q2 line 55 -- "this same thought".
- 1943 Q1 misplaces "present" (cf. Q2 line 53). Its meaning has been misunderstood, for while "present death" (Q2) means "immediate death", "present sale" (Q1) can only mean "sale nowadays".
- 1945 "and here about he dwels": Q1 misplaces this, which derives from Q2 line 40.
- 1944 Q1 "Here he might buy it" Q2 (line 54) "Here liues a Caitiffe wretch would sell it him". With the Q1 version cf. Q2 V iii 295-6 -- "And here he writes, that he did buy a poyson / Of a poore Pothecarie".
- 1950-1 Q1 "some such speeding geere,/As will dispatch the wearie takers life" Q2 (lines 63-5) "such soone speeding geare,/"

As will dispearse it selfe through all the veines,/That the life-wearie-taker may fall dead...". With the Q1 version cf. Q2 line 82 of this scene, where the Apothecary says "if you had the strength/Of twentie men, it would dispatch you straight". An anticipation.

- 1955 Q1 "the law is death to those that sell them" Q2 (lines 69-70) "Mantuas lawe/Is death to any he that vtters them". Q1 confuses this with Q2 line 53 -- "Whose sale is present death in Mantua".
- 1956 Q1 "pouertie" Q2 (line 71) "wretchednesse". Q1 anticipates 'pouertie' in Q2 lines 78-9 (Q1 1962-3).
- 1958 Q1 "The Law is not thy frend, nor the Lawes frend" Q2 (line 75) "The world is not thy friend, nor the worlds law". Hubbard (p.5) suggests that the second 'the' in Q1 1958 is a simple misprint for 'thou': on the other hand it is just possible that the Q1 construction has been exactly modelled on that of Q2, to the complete detriment of the sense. I suspect a confusion with III iii 145 (found in Q2 only) -- "The law that threatned death becomes thy friend".
- 1960 Q1 "Vpon thy backe hangs ragged Miserie" Q2 (line 74) "Contempt and beggerie hangs vpon thy backe". The Q1 reporter probably had in mind two phrases used earlier in the Q2 version of this scene in Romeo's description of the apothecary, viz. (i) Q2 line 41 "In tattred weeds" (ii) do. line 43 "Sharpe miserie....".
- 1963 Q1 "pay" Q2 line 79 "pray". Clearly Q1 is right here. Knight's argument in favour of 'pray' is sheer nonsense ("The relation here is between Romeo's earnestly repeated prayer and the apothecary's consent: the moment for paying him is not yet arrived": see Furness, p.266): on the contrary the relation is between the apothecary's poverty and will, and Knight failed to appreciate Romeo's wit.
- 1968 By substituting "cloathes" for Q2's "foode" (line 87) Q1 misses the point of the second half of the line ("get thy selfe in (Q1 thee into) flesh").



Act V Scene ii.

- 1973 Q1 "What newes from Mantua" Q2 (line 3) "Welcome from Mantua". Possibly Q1 contains an inexact recollection of V i 12 (Q1 1917) where, on the entry of his servant, Romeo cries "Newes from Verona". In Q2 Juliet asks the Nurse "what newes?" at II v 17 and III ii 34.
- "what will Romeo come?": cf. Q2 IV i 115-7, where the Friar says "In the meane time...../ Shall Romeo by my Letters know our drift, / And hither shall he come". (Cf. also Q2 V ii 29, V iii 254-5, etc.).
- 1979 "examinde": this word is not found in Q2 at all. It is used again in Q1 in line 2123.
- 1982 Q1 "Now, by my holy Order" Q2 (line 17) "by my Brotherhood". Q1 contains here a recollection of III iii 120 (Q1 line 1375) where the Friar says "By my holy order".
- 1985 Q1 "A spade and mattocke" Q2 (line 21) "an Iron Crow". Q1 anticipates Q2 V iii 193 -- "this Mattocke and this Spade".
- 1988-9 Q1 "Least that the Ladie should before I come/Be wakde from sleepe". The corresponding line in the Q2 version is "Within this three houres will faire Iuliet wake" (line 25). With the Q1 version cf. (i) Q2 IV iii 30-2 -- "How if when I am laid into the Tombe,/I wake before the time that Romeo/ Come to redeeme me....."; (b) Q2 IV i 105-7 -- "And in this borrowed likeness of shrunk death/Thou shalt continue two and fortie houres,/And then awake as from a pleasant sleepe". Vague combined recollections of these two passages seem to have contributed to Q1 1988-9.
- 1989 "I will hye": the verb "hie" is used in Q2 at the following points: II v 67, 71, 76; III ii 141; iii 170; v 26.
- 1990 "To free her from that Tombe of miserie": there is nothing directly corresponding to this in the Q2 version of the scene. The Q1 line is modelled on such lines as Q2 V iii 256 "to take her from her borrowed graue" and do. 262 "to take her from her kindreds Vault"; Q1 2170 has "take her from the Toombe". The verb "free" is probably a recollection of Q2 IV i 120, where the Friar, having outlined his plan, says to Juliet "And this shall free thee from this present shame".



Act V Scene iii.

- 1991 "Put out the torch": two phrases in Q2 are combined -- line 1 "Giue me thy Torch" and line 2 "Yet put it out".
- "and lye....Ew-tree": note Q1's inversion (cf. Q2 line 3).
- 1992 "Ew-tree": in line 3 Q2 has "yond young Trees", which should probably be emended to "yond yew trees" with assistance from Q1.
- 1994 Here Q1 fuses elements from Q2 lines 5 and 7 into a line of its own.
- 1995 "Staight (sic.) giue me notice": cf. Q2 line 18 -- "The Boy giues warning", and also Q2 V ii 26-7, where the Friar says "Shee will beshrewe me much that Romeo / Hath had no notice of these accidents". This last occurs only four lines before the opening of this scene.
- 1997-2004 The first line of this speech reproduces Q2 line 12 exactly, except for an inversion. Thereafter the Q1 version is distinct from that of Q2. Hubbard (Wisconsin Studies, 19, p.26) compares "the perfect modell of eternitie" (2000) with such expressions in older plays as "the perfect platforme of a troubled wight" (*Lochrine*, IV i 51) and "a perfect patterne of all chiuallrie" (*ibid* I i 106), in support of his contention that here Q1 presents a version of the speech anterior to that given in Q2, which is a Shakespearian revision. But the presence in Q1 of what Hubbard calls an "antique" style does not necessarily point to his conclusion: Mommsen's hack-poet or Hoppe's versifying reporter might have been addicted to this style of writing. Hoppe suggests that in the stage-abridgement which underlies the reported text "Paris was interrupted by the entrance of Romeo and Balthasar just after speaking the first line" (i.e. Q2 line 12, Q1 1997). The speech has been filled out by the reporter turned versifier, who had clear knowledge only of the abridgement and who therefore relied on his recollection of stray fragments eked out by invention. Lines 2001-2 can be accounted for as being based on recollected fragments from other passages in the play (see notes below): and there is a further strong argument against Hubbard's position: whereas the rhyme-scheme of the Q2 speech is regular (a b a b c c), that of Q1 is incoherent (a b x b x a x); this suggests a reporter or a hack-poet rather than an authentic pre-Shakespearian or first-Shakespearian version where we would expect metrical consistency. (On this passage see Hoppe, R.E.S. 1938 pp. 283-4).

- 2001 "Faire Iuliet that with Angells dost remaine": Hoppe suggests that this may be an echo of Q2 IV v 76-7 -- "she is aduanst / Aboue the Cloudes, as high as heauen it selfe" (R.E.S. 1938 p.284). I would rather claim that it is indebted to a recollection of Q2 V i 19 (cf. Q1 line 1923) -- "And her immortall part (Q1 parts) with Angels liues (Q1 dwell)".
- 2002 "Accept this latest fauour at my hands": possibly there is here a vague anticipation of Q2 V iii 98-100, where Romeo addresses the dead Tybalt thus: "O what more fauour can I do to thee, / Then with that hand that cut thy youth in twaine, / To sunder his that was thineemie?"
- 2004 "With funerall praises doo adorne thy Tombe": the writer may have had in mind some such line as Titus Andronicus I i 388 -- "Till we with trophies do adorne thy tomb".
- 2007 "was": a simple misprint for "way" (cf. Q2 line 19).
- 2010 Q1 "this mattocke, and this wrentching Iron" Q2 (line 22) "that mattocke and the wrenching Iron". The Q1 version contains a confusion with Q2 line 193: "We tooke this Mattocke and this Spade from him".
- 2014 "So get thee gone and trouble me no more": this corresponds to Q2 line 32 "therefore hence be gone". The Q1 line contains an anticipation of Q2 line 40, where Romeo's servant says "I will be gone sir, and not trouble ye" (cf. Q1 line 2024).
- 2019-20 Q1 "but if thou wilt stay,/Further to prie..." Q2 (line 33) "But if thou iealous dost returne to prie". The Q1 version contains an anticipation of Q2 lines 140-1, where Balthasar tells the Friar that Romeo "fearefully did menace me with death / If I did stay to looke on his entents".
- 2020 "in what I vndertake": this corresponds to Q2 line 34 -- "In what I farther shall intend to doo". The Q1 version may contain a recollection of Q2 IV i 74 (Q1 1698), where the Friar says to Juliet "Then is it likely thou wilt vndertake/A thing like death" (Q1 "Tis not vnlike that thou etc.").
- 2035 "I doe attach thee as a fellow heere": this is composed of fragments of two separate lines fused together: (1) Q2 line 69 "...apprehend thee for a Fellow here"; (2) Q2 line 181 "Go some of you, who ere you find attach".
- 2036 "The Law condemnes thee, therefore thou must dye": fragments of Q2 lines 56-7 contribute to the composition of

this line: "condemned villaine", "for thou must die".  
The writer may also have had in mind the purport of III  
iii 26 (Q1 1288) -- "Thy fault our law calls death".

2038 "be gone": derived from Q2 line 63.

2040-1 "By shedding of thy bloud" Q2 line 63 "By vrging me to  
furie". Not inconceivably the Q1 reading is founded on a  
recollection of III ii 73 (Q1 1235) -- "did Romeos hand  
shead Tibalts bloud?" (spoken by Juliet).

Q1 "I doe protest/I loue thee better than I loue my selfe":  
Q2 line 64 "By heauen I loue thee better then myselfe".  
This Q2 line has been confused in the transmission of the  
Q1 text with III i 64-5 (Q1 1097-8), where Romeo says to  
Tybalt "I do protest I neuer iniuried thee,/But loue thee  
better then thou canst deuise".

2043 Q1 "coniurations" Q2 line 68 "commiration". Q3 "corrects"  
the Q2 reading to "commiseration", followed by Fl. Mommsen  
conjectured "commination" (see Furness p.275). The most  
natural explanation of the Q2 corruption is that it is a  
"minim-miswriting" or misreading of "coniuration".

2044 Q1 "doe attach" Q2 line 69 "apprehend": see note on Q1  
line 2035.

2045 Q1 "What dost thou tempt me" Q2 line 70 "Wilt thou prouoke  
me?" Here Q1 contains a recollection of Q2 line 59 --  
"Good gentle youth tempt not a desprate man" (cf. Q1 line  
2038).

2046 This line is printed in Q2 (line 71) in italic type, with-  
out assignation. Mommsen declared that "the italics of  
Q2Q3 show that these lines (sic) were spoken behind the  
scenes" (see Furness p.277). This is most improbable. It  
seems reasonable to suppose that the line was assigned to  
"Boy" in either the transcriber's or the compositor's 'copy',  
and that one or other of these people thought this an  
erroneous repetition of the word "boy" at the end of the  
preceding line and, catching sight of the words "they fight",  
stupidly understood this line as a stage-direction. Q4  
prints the line in Roman type and assigns it to "Page". F  
gives it to Peter and also prints it in Roman.

2052 Q1 "as we past a long" Q2 line 77 "as we rode". With the  
Q1 version cf. III iii 155 (Q1 1391) "For then thou canst  
not passe to Mantua" (spoken by the Friar to Romeo), and  
II iii 64 (Q1 783) "Ile tell thee as we (Q1 I) passe"  
(spoken by Romeo to the Friar).

- 2053-4 Q1 adapts Q2 lines 77-9 freely, and its structure is extremely awkward.
- 2055-6 These lines have no counterpart in Q2; they may be attributed to the versifying reporter.
- 2061-2 "Ah deare Iuliet,/How well thy beauty doth become this graue?" This is peculiar to Q1: the versifying reporter probably had in mind the purport of Q2 lines 85-6 -- "for here lies Iuliet, and her bewtie makes / This Vault a feasting presence full of light".
- 2064 "...death...doth court my loue" (also peculiar to Q1). There may be here a faint recollection of the Friar's words to Romeo at III iii 148 (Q1 line 1384) -- "Happiness courts thee in her (Q1 his) best array".
- 2071 Q1 "Thy drugs are swift" Q2 line 124 "Thy drugs are quicke". With the Q1 variant cf. Q2 V i 37 where Romeo, resolving on poison, exclaims "O mischief thou art swift,/To enter in the thoughts of desperate men".
- 2072 Q1 omits the necessary speech-heading (Friar).
- 2072-3 Q1 takes material from Q2 lines 125-6 and fills it out to produce two metrical lines.  
"as I did passe along" (not in Q2): cf. Q1 line 2052 and note.
- 2076 "Who is it that consorts so late the dead": peculiar to Q1. There may be here a faint recollection of Q2 II i 31-2 -- "he hath hid himself among these trees/To be consorted with the humerous night" (spoken by Benvolio): cf. Q1 lines 544-5.
- 2079-80 Q1 "there is one/That loues you dearely" Q2 line 132 "theres my maister, one that you loue". Not inconceivably the Q1 version contains a recollection of III iv 3 (Q1 line 1411) -- "she lou'd her kinsman Tybalt dearely" (spoken by Capulet to Paris).
- 2087-8 Q1 "On paine of death he chargde me to be gone, /And not for to disturbe him in his enterprize" Q2 lines 140-1 "And fearefully did menace me with death/If I did stay to looke on his entents". With the Q1 version cf. the following passages in the authentic text:- (1) V iii 25-6 "I charge thee.... stand all aloofe" (2) do. 32 "therefore hence be gone" (3) do. 40 "I will be gone sir, and not trouble ye"; cf. also (4) I i 96 "Once more on paine of death, all men depart", and do. 84 and 89 where the verb



"disturb" is used. It would seem that Q1 2087-8 were composed of various remembered fragments welded together into metrical verse.

- 2089 "my mind presageth ill": cf. Q2 V i 2, Q1 1909: a possible recollection.
- 2091 Q1 "monument" Q2 line 149 "Sepulchre": "monument" occurs in Q2 at III v 211, V i 18, V ii 24, V iii 131, 201, 281.
- 2093 "Ah me I doubt,": cf. Q2 line 44 -- "and his intents I doubt". Possibly a blurred recollection.
- "what Romeo dead?" The corresponding words in Q2 are "Romeo, oh pale!" (line 152). With the Q1 version cf. Q2, this scene, lines 204 ("And Romeo dead") and 267 ("The Noble Paris, and true Romeo dead"). Anticipation.
- 2094 "what vnluckie houre" Q2 line 153 "what an vnkind hower". With the Q1 variant cf. Q2 III i 142 ("The vnluckie mannage of this fatall brall": cf. Q1 1162) and III iv 1 ("Things haue falne out sir so vnluckily": cf. Q1 1409). Note also that for Q2 line 143 of this scene -- "some ill vnthrifitie thing" -- the later Qq. and the Ff. have "unlucky", a reading adopted by many editors: but unless it can be shown to be based on revision or on a fresh consultation of an authentic MS. the reading has, of course, no authority above that of a conjecture.
- 2095 "so foule a sinne": I suspect an inexact anticipation of Q2 line 206 -- "this foule murder". "Sinne" may just possibly be a recollection of Q2 line 62 (Q1 2039).
- 2099-100 "I cannot see / Him for whose sake I vndertook this hazard": recollection of two earlier passages has contributed to the composition of these lines: (a) IV i 74-5 -- "Then is it likely thou wilt vndertake/A thing like death" (cf. Q1 1698-9); (b) III iii 141-2 -- "thy Iuliet is alieue,/For whose deare sake thou wast but lately dead" (cf. Q1 1379-80).
- 2101 Q1 "come foorth" Q2 line 159 "come from that nest / Of death": rather than that the Q1 reading shows a confusion with the Friar's command to Romeo at III iii 1 ("come forth, come forth thou fearefull man"), I would suggest anticipation of Q2 V iii 268, where, in his narration, the Friar says "I entreated her come forth".
- 2102 "We shall be taken": probably a reminiscence of III iii 78, where the Friar warns Romeo "Thou wilt be taken" (cf. Q1 line 1333).



- 2102-3 "Paris he is slaine,/And Romeo dead": an anticipation. Cf. Q2 lines 203-4 -- "here lies the County Paris slain, / And Romeo dead,.....".
- 2105 The epithet "close" applied to "Nunery" may be the result of a vague anticipation of Q2 line 263, where the Friar tells of the intention he had formed "to keepe her closely at my Cell".
- 2106 "Ah leaue me, leaue me": this may well be a recollection of Q2 V i 31 and/or V iii 60, at both of which points Romeo urges his companion to "leaue me".
- 2107 "I heare some noise": a repetition; cf. Q1 2101, which corresponds to Q2 line 159.
- 2112-3 "then I must be resolute./O happy dagger thou shalt end my feare": cf. Q2 IV i 54-5, where Juliet says to the Friar "Do thou but call my resolution wise,/And with this knife ile helpe it presently".
- 2114 "Rest in my bosome": an anticipation of Q2 line 213, where Capulet talks of the dagger "misssheathd in my daughters bosome". "Rest" might be a misapprehension of the Q2 "rust" (line 178).
- "thus I come to thee": a confusion is apparent here with Juliet's drinking of the potion: at Q1 line 1800 she cries "Romeo I come, this doe I drinke to thee". And in view of this confusion, it is possible that Juliet's "feare" (line 2113 above) is a recollection of the "faint cold feare" she experienced just before drinking the potion (Q2 IV iii 16).
- 2115 Q1 "Come looke about" Q2 line 180 "search about the Churchyard". Possibly the Q1 version contains a recollection of Q2 III v 41 -- "be wary, looke about".
- 2118 "attach" is derived from Q2 line 181.
- 2120 Tools "fitte to ope a tombe": there is here an anticipation of words in Q2 line 290 -- "Anon comes one with light to ope the Tombe".
- 2121 "keep him safe": this corresponds to Q2 line 195 "stay the Friar too too (sic)". The Q1 version is based on Q2 line 191 -- "Hold him (i.e. Balthasar) in safetie till the Prince come hither".
- 2124 "What early mischiefe calls vs vp so soone": this combines elements from Q2 lines 196-7 -- "What misaduenture is so

early vp,/That calls our person from our morning rest?" Possibly the construction of the Q1 line was affected by a recollection of Q1 line 752 (cf. Q2 II iii 33) -- "what earlie tongue so soone (Q2 sweete) saluteth me?" (spoken by the Friar).

Q1 mischiefe: possibly a recollection of Q2 V i 37-8 -- "O mischiefe thou art swift,/To enter in the thoughts of desperate men" (Romeo).

2125 "O noble Prince": probably a recollection of III i 141 (Q1 1161), where Benvolio says "O (Q1 Ah) Noble Prince, I can discouer all".

2126-7 "Where Juliet that hath lyen intoombd two dayes,/Warme and fresh bleeding,": this is based on inexact recollection of Q2 lines 183-4 -- "And Iuliet bleeding, warme, and newlie dead:/Who heere hath laine this two daies buried". A verb is wanting in the Q1 version. The phrase "newlie dead" is inexactly recollected in Q1 2128 -- "Romeo and Countie Paris/Likewise newly slaine".

The recollection of Q2 183-4 was probably caused by the fact that the phrase "warme and new kild" in Q2 205 carried the reporter back to "warme, and newlie dead" in 183.

2129 Q1 "Search seeke about" Q2 line 206 "Search, seeke & know.....". Q1 here contains a recollection of Q2 line 180 -- "Search about the Churchyard...".

Q1 "to finde the murderers": cf. Q2 line 181 "who ere you find attach". A recollection.

2130 "What rumor's this that is so early vp?": this is derived from Q2 line 196 -- "What misaduenture is so early vp,".

2133 "such a mutinie": we are reminded of the Prologue, Q2 version, line 3 -- two households "breake to new mutinie". Cf. also I v 82 (Q1 line 453).

2139 "Dread Souereigne": a recollection of Q2 line 203 -- "Soueraine,...".

2139-40 Lady Montague's death is announced in Q2 line 218, Q1 2139: in the next line Q2 gives the reason for her death -- grief for Romeo's exile; but in place of this, Q1 (line 2140) announces Benvolio's death. In the prolegomena to his parallel-text edition (p. 160) Mommsen points out that the news contained in Q1 2140 is a bolt from the blue: it certainly seems unnecessary that Benvolio should die. Further, the line is extremely prosaic; and the omission

in Q1 of the reason for Lady Montague's death renders the passage decidedly awkward in that text. Mommsen would regard 2140 as an interpolation made by the hack-poet: he is emphatic that it cannot hale from any Shakespearian Romeo.

- 2141 Q1 "mischiefe" Q2 line 220 "woe". Cf. Q1 line 2124.
- 2146 This repeats the substance of Q1 line 2129.
- 2149-89 A full commentary on this long speech appears in the first section of the Introduction. It is a cento of fragments recollected from various parts of the play, welded together into respectable but dull blank verse.
- 2192 Q1 "I brought my maister word" Q2 line 279 "...newes". The Q1 variant is just possibly a recollection of II ii 148 (Q1 line 684) where Juliet says to Romeo "send me word tomorrow".
- 2194-5 "These Letters he deliuered me,/Charging me early giue them to his Father": a confused recollection of material at Q2 V iii 23-4: "Hold take this Letter, early in the morning/See thou deliuer it to my Lord and father" (cf. Q1 2012-3, where we have "these letters"). Note that in the next line in Q2 (25) Romeo says "I charge thee".
- 2197 Q1 "that calld the VWatch" Q2 line 286 "that raisd the Watch". Q1 contains here either a recollection of Q2 line 71, where the Boy says "I will go call the Watch" (Q1 2046), or (more probably) an anticipation of Q2 line 292, Q1 2200, where the Boy says "I ran (away Q2) to call the Watch".
- 2198 "I brought my Master vnto Juliets graue": this seems to combine elements from two separate lines in the Q2 version of this scene, viz. (1) 279 -- "I brought my maister newes of Iuliets death", and (2) "He came with flowers to strew his Ladies graue". If so, the narratives of Balthasar (1) and the Boy (2) have been confused.
- 2199 "But one approaching...": probably a recollection of Q2 line 18 (Q1 2006), where Paris says "something doth approach". Cf. also Q2 lines 7-8.
- "straight": this word has already been used in Q1 in line 1995.
- 2200 "At last they fought": possibly a recollection of Q2 line 71 (Q1 2046), where the Boy says "O Lord they fight".

BIBLIOGRAPHY.ROMEO AND JULIET.

Chambers, E. K. William Shakespeare, 1930, Vol. I, pp. 338-47.

Clark, W. G. and Wright, W. Aldis Works of Shakespeare  
(Cambridge edition), Vol. VII (1865), Introduction,  
pp. vii-xi.

Daniel, P. A. Romeo and Juliet: Parallel Texts of the First  
Two Quartos, with Introduction (New Shakspeare  
Society, 1874).

Romeo and Juliet: Revised edition of the Second  
Quarto, with introduction (New Shakspeare Society,  
1875).

Dowden, Edward Romeo and Juliet, Arden edition (1900),  
Introduction.

Evans, H. A. Introductions to the Praetorius facsimiles of  
Romeo and Juliet Q1 and Q2 (1886).

Field, B. R. The Bankside Shakespeare, Vol. V (1889) (The  
Shakespeare Society of New York).

Fitzgerald, J. D. "Transcription in the Pirated Plays of  
Shakespeare": Times Literary Supplement, May 13,  
1920 (p. 303).

Fleay, F. G. "The Text of Romeo and Juliet": Macmillan's  
Magazine, Vol. XXXVI (1877), pp. 195-202.

Furness, H. H. Romeo and Juliet, New Variorum Edition, 1871.

Gericke, Robert "Romeo and Juliet nach Shakespeares Manu-  
script", Shakespeare Jahrbuch, Vol. XIV (1879),  
pp. 207 seq. (especially pp. 269-72).

Gray, H. D. "Romeo, Rosaline, and Juliet", Modern Language  
Notes, Vol. XXIX (1914) pp. 209-12.

Greg, W. W. Principles of Emendation in Shakespeare (British  
Academy Shakespeare Lecture, 1928): re-printed in  
Aspects of Shakespeare, 1933 -- see especially pp.  
144-7, 175-81.

- Hjort, Gertrude "The Good and Bad Quartos of 'Romeo and Juliet' and 'Love's Labour's Lost'", Modern Language Review, Vol. XXI (1926), pp. 140 seq.
- Hoppe, H. R. "The First Quarto Version of Romeo and Juliet, II vi and IV v 43 ff.", Review of English Studies, Vol. XIV (1938), pp. 271-84.
- Hubbard, F. G. The First Quarto Edition of Shakespeare's 'Romeo and Juliet', edition with Introduction: Wisconsin University Studies in Language and Literature, No. 19 (1924).
- Mommsen, Tycho "'Hamlet' 1603; and 'Romeo and Juliet' 1597", The Athenaeum, Vol. XXIX (1857), p. 182.
- Shakespeare's Romeo und Julia; eine kritische Ausgabe des überlieferten Doppeltextes (1859): with Prolegomena (see especially pp. 157-74).
- Pollard, A. W. & Wilson, J. Dover "The 'Stolne and Surreptitious' Shakespearian Texts"; Romeo and Juliet: Times Literary Supplement, August 14, 1919.
- Ridley, M. R. Romeo and Juliet, New Temple edition (1935) Introduction.
- Robertson J. M. The Shakespeare Canon, Vol. III (1925), pp. 113 seq.
- Schöttner, Adolf "Über die mutmassliche stenographische Entstehung der Q1 von Shakespeare's 'Romeo and Juliet'", Archiv für Schriftkunde, Jahrgang I (1918) pp. 229-340.
- Spalding, T. A. On the First Quarto of 'Romeo and Juliet': Is there Any Evidence of a Second Hand in it? (Transactions of the New Shakspeare Society, 1877-9, pp. 58-87.
- Van Dam, B. A. P. "Did Shakespeare Revise Romeo and Juliet?", Anglia, Vol. LI (1927), pp. 39 seq.



THE Taming of a Shrew

THE PROBLEM OF

THE PROBLEM OF "THE TAMING OF A SHREW".

A little and pleasant comedy called The Taming of the Shrew. As it was acted by his majesties servants at the Swan Theatre and the Swan. Written by William Shakespeare. Printed by I. B. for Iohn Iohnstone, and are to be sold at his Shop in Saint Dunstons Churchward under the Diall.

THE TAMING OF A SHREW.THE PROBLEM.

The following entry appears in the Stationers' Register:

(1594) Secundo die Maij. Peter Shorte. Entred vnto him for his copie vnder master warden Cawoodes hande, a booke intituled A plesant Conceyted historie called the Tamyng of a Shrowe vjd.

And in 1594 a quarto was issued with the title-page

A Pleasant Conceited Historie, called The taming of a Shrew. As it was sundry times acted by the Right honorable the Earle of Pembrook his seruants. Printed at London by Peter Short and are to be sold by Cuthbert Burbie, at his shop at the Royall Exchange. 1594.

A reprint was issued in 1596 with the imprint P. S., sold by Cuthbert Burbie. In the Stationers' Register, 22 January 1607, "The taminge of A Shrewe" was assigned to Nicholas Ling "with consent of Master Burby vnder his handwrytinge", and a reprint appeared in the same year, with the imprint V. S. (i.e. Valentine Simmes) for Nicholas Ling. In the Stationers' Register, 19 November 1607, "The taminge of A Shrewe" is assigned to John Smythick, one of a number of 'bookes' "Whiche dyd belonge to Nicholas Lynge". Smethwick did not publish an edition until 1631, when a quarto appeared containing the text of Shakespeare's Taming of The Shrew:

A Wittie and Pleasant Comedie Called The Taming of the Shrew. As it was acted by his Maiesties Seruants at the Blacke Friers and the Globe. Written by Will. Shakespeare. Printed by W. S. for Iohn Smethwicke, and are to be sold at his Shop in Saint Dunstones Churchyard vnder the Diall.

1631.

This Quarto was printed from the Folio of 1623.<sup>1</sup>

The relationship between A Shrew and The Shrew remains a debated problem. There are three separate hypotheses in the field: (1) that A Shrew is one of the 'sources' of The Shrew; this was for long the general view, and it still has many adherents, notably Sir Edmund Chambers: (2) that A Shrew post-dates The Shrew, and is founded on it; associated with this view are the names of Hickson, Creizenach, Smart, Alexander, Dover Wilson, Van Dam, Ridley: (3) that A Shrew and The Shrew are independently derived from a common source which is lost; this is the view of ten Brink and Hardin Craig. It is the purpose of the following pages to review the arguments which have been put forward in favour of the several theories.

- 
1. See E. K. Chambers, William Shakespeare, Vol. I, p.323: "The bibliographical data up to 1607 relate to The Taming of a Shrew, but it is clear that A Shrew and The Shrew were regarded commercially as the same, and that the copyright acquired by Smethwick in 1607 covered both F1 and the Q of 1631, which was printed from it."

THE BORROWINGS FROM MARLOWE.

The Taming of A Shrew contains a considerable number of direct borrowings from plays of Marlowe: I give a full list here, the references to A Shrew being to the signatures of the 1594 Quarto and the pages of W. C. Hazlitt's reprint in Part II volume 2 of his edition of Shakespeare's Library (1875). Borrowings are noted by F. S. Boas in his edition of A Shrew (Shakespeare Classics series, 1908) and by R. Warwick Bond (Arden ed. of The Shrew, intro. p. xxxviii).

1. A Shrew, sig. A4 (p. 496):

Ile fetch you lustie steedes more swift of pace  
Then winged Pegasus in all his pride,  
That ran so swiftlie ouer Persian plaines.

sig. C4 (p. 513):

Thou shalt haue garments wrought of Median silke,  
Enchast with pretious Iewells fetcht from far,  
By Italian Marchants that with Russian stemes,  
Plous vp huge furrowes in the Terren Maine,....

Cf. I Tamburlaine the Great, I ii 93-6, 192-5:

A hundred Tartars shall attend on thee,  
Mounted on steeds swifter than Pegasus.  
Thy garments shall be made of Median silk,  
Enchas'd with precious jewels of mine own,...

Both we will walk upon the lofty cliffs,  
And Christian merchants, that with Russian stems  
Plough up huge furrows in the Caspian Sea,  
Shall vail to us as lords of all the lake.

2. A Shrew, sig. C3 (p. 510):

Eternal heauen sooner be dissolude,  
And al that pearseth Phebus siluer eie,  
Before such hap befall to Polidor.

Cf. I Tamburlaine, III ii 18-20:

Eternal heaven sooner be dissolv'd  
And all that pierceth Phoebe's silver eye,  
Before such hap fall to Zenocrate!

3. A Shrew, sig. B1 (p. 498):

But staie; what dames are these so bright of hew  
Whose eies are brighter then the lampes of heauen,  
Fairer then rocks of pearle and pretious stone,....

Cf. I Tamburlaine, III iii 117-120:

Zenocrate, the loveliest maid alive,  
Fairer than rocks of pearl and precious stone,  
The only paragon of Tamburlaine;  
Whose eyes are brighter than the lamps of heaven,....

4. A Shrew, sig. C4 (p. 513):

Father I sweare by Ibis golden beake....

Cf. I Tamburlaine, IV iii 36-7:

A sacred vow to heaven and him I make,  
Confirming it with Ibis' holy name.....

5. A Shrew, sig. Blv (p. 499):

And yet I needs must loue his second daughter  
The image of honour and nobility,  
In whose sweet person is comprisde the summe  
Of natures skill and heauenly maiesty.

Cf. I Tamburlaine, V ii ll ff.:

Most happy king and emperor of the earth,  
Image of honour and nobility,.....  
In whose sweet person is compris'd the sum  
Of nature's skill and heavenly majesty...

6. A Shrew, sig. B2 (p. 500):

O might I see the center of my soule  
Whose sacred beauty hath enchanted me,  
More faire then was the Grecian Helena  
For whose sweet sake so many princes dide,  
That came with thousand ships to Tenedos.



Cf. II Tamburlaine, II iv 84 ff.:

..Whose darts do pierce the centre of my soul.  
Her sacred beauty hath enchanted heaven,  
And had she liv'd before the siege of Troy,  
Helen, whose beauty summoned Greece to arms,  
And drew a thousand ships to Tenedos,  
Had not been nam'd in Homer's Iliads.....

7. A Shrew, sig. C2v (p. 510):

Come faire Emilia my louely loue,  
Brighter then the burnisht pallace of the sunne,  
The eie-sight of the glorious firmament,....

Cf. II Tamburlaine, II iv 105-6:

Batter the shining palace of the sun,  
And shiver all the starry firmament,....

8. A Shrew, sig. C4 (p. 512):

...as richly wrought  
As was the Massie Robe that late adorn'd  
The stately legat of the Persian King...

Cf. II Tamburlaine, III ii 123-4:

And I sat down, cloth'd with the massy robe  
That late adorn'd the Afric potentate....

9. A Shrew, sig. A2 (p. 492):

Now that the gloomie shaddow of the night,  
Longing to view Orions drisling lookes,  
Leapes from th'antarticke VWorld vnto the skie  
And dims the VVelkin with her pitchie breath,  
And darksome night oreshades the christall heauens etc.

Cf. Dr Faustus, scene iii, lines 1-4:

Now that the gloomy shadow of the night,  
Longing to view Orion's drizzling look,  
Leaps from th'antartic world unto the sky,  
And dims the welkin with her pitchy breath,  
Faustus, begin thine incantations,....

10. A Shrew, sig. C4v (p. 513-4):

Boy. Come hither sirha boy.

San. Boy; oh disgrace to my person, souns boy  
Of your face, you haue many boyes with such  
Pickadeuaunts I am sure, souns would you  
Not haue a bloudy nose for this?

Boy. Come, come, I did but iest...

Cf. Dr Faustus, scene iv, beginning:

Wagner. Come hither, sirrah boy.

Clown. Boy! O disgrace to my person. Zounds, boy in  
your face.

You have seen many boys with beards, I am sure.

Wag. Sirrah, hast thou no comings in?

Clo. Yes, and goings out too, you may see, sir.

Wag. Alas, poor slave! see how poverty jests in his  
nakedness!

This is the 1616 version of Faustus sc. iv: A Shrew has 'of'  
for 'in' and 'such Pickadeuaunts' for 'beards', and in the lat-  
ter particular it agrees with the 1604 text of Faustus, in  
which the beginning of sc. iv runs thus:

Wag. Sirrah boy, come hither.

Clo. How, boy! swowns, boy! I hope you have seen  
many boys with such pickadevaunts as I  
have. Boy, quotha! etc.

See Boas, ed. Faustus, pp. 74, 76.

11. A Shrew, sig. E3v (p. 528):

I would with piteous lookes and pleasing words,  
As once did Orpheus with his harmony,  
And rauishing sound of his melodious harpe,  
Intreate grim Pluto.....

Cf. Dr Faustus, scene vi, lines 28-30:

And hath not he, that built the walls of Thebes,  
With ravishing sound of his melodious harp,  
Made music with my Mephistophilis?

The above 11 parallels are cited by Bond, with acknowledgment  
to Bullen (ed. of Marlowe) for Nos. 1, 8 and 11, and to

Courthope (History of English Poetry) for Nos. 2 and 5. Boas cites the following in addition.

12. A Shrew, sig. C3 (p. 511):

...I did cause millions of labouring Moores  
To vndermine the cauernes of the earth,  
To seeke for strange and new found pretious stones,  
And diue into the sea to gather pearle...

Cf. Dr Faustus, sc. i, lines 81-2:

Ransack the ocean for orient pearl,  
And search all corners of the new found world.

13. In reference to No. 8 Boas also quotes I Tamburlaine, III i 43-4:

And show your pleasure to the Persian  
As fits the legate of the stately Turk.

Thus the quotation from A Shrew is a conflation.

14. A Shrew, sig. C4 (p. 513):

Sweet Kate, the louelier then Diana's purple robe,  
Whiter then are the snowie Apenis.

Cf. I Tamburlaine, I ii 87-9:

Zenocrate, lovelier than the love of Jove,  
Brighter than is the silver Rhodolfe,  
Fairer than whitest snow on Scythian hills.

and also II Tamburlaine, I i 111:

...That rests upon the snowy Appenines.

Another conflation in A Shrew.

15. In reference to No. 1 Boas also quotes II Tamburlaine, I i 37:

The Terren Main wherein Danubius falls.

Thus A Shrew's line "Plous vp huge furrows in the Terren

Maine" is a conflation of (i) Plough up huge furrows in the Caspian Sea" (I Tamb. I ii 194) and (ii) The Terren Main wherein Danubius falls (II Tamb. I i 37).

16. A Shrew, sig. F2 (p. 534):

This angrie sword should rip thy hatefull chest,  
And hewd thee smaller than the Libian sands.

Cf. Dr Faustus (1616 text) sc. x:

And had you cut my body with your swords  
Or hew'd this flesh and bones as small as sand  
Yet in a minute had my spirit return'd.....

The New Cambridge editors add one other case (intro.

The Shrew, p. xxi):

17. A Shrew, sig D3v (p. 520):

Were she as stubborne or as full of strength  
As were the Thracian horse Alcides tamde,  
That King Egeus fed with flesh of men,  
Yet would I pull her down, and make her come  
As hungry hawkes do flie vnto their lure.

Cf. II Tamburlaine, IV iii 12 ff.:

The headstrong jades of Thrace Alcides tam'd  
That King Egeus fed with human flesh  
And made so wanton that they knew their strengths  
Were not subdued with valour more divine,  
Than you by this unconquered arme of mine.

MARLOWE'S HAND IN 'A SHREW'?

In two articles in Notes and Queries, 1st series, Vol. I, 1849-50 (pp. 194 ff. and 226 ff.) Samuel Hickson argued that Marlowe was the author of A Shrew. I do not think that it is generally remembered that Hickson discovered several of the parallels between A Shrew and passages in Marlowe's Tamburlaine and Faustus which are listed above, viz. Nos. 3, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 13. He also adduced one or two other parallels, not so exact. From these direct borrowings from Marlowe in A Shrew, supported by general resemblances to the style of Marlowe, Hickson concluded that A Shrew should be included in the list of that author's works.

In his Shakespeare Manual, 1876 (p. 186, postscript) Fleay enunciates the following hypothesis (which he later abandoned):

The original Taming of a Shrew was written by Shakespeare and Marlowe in conjunction for L. Pembroke's company; Shakespeare writing the prose scenes and Marlowe the verse. In 1600 The Whole Contention, Hamlet, Titus Andronicus, and The Taming of a Shrew, became the property of the Chamberlain's Men, all having formerly belonged to Pembroke's. Shakespeare re-wrote his own part of the Taming of a Shrew, and Lodge re-wrote Marlowe's; hence our present play The Taming of the Shrew.

At the moment we are not concerned with the points in the second sentence which we should dispute -- the date 1600 and the inclusion of Hamlet in that list: the various points in that sentence occupy us elsewhere. As regards the theory of the authorship of A Shrew, I cannot find any full discussion of the matter in Fleay.



In the section on 'Marlowe and Comedy' in Vol. II of his Shakespeare Canon (p. 134 ff.) J. M. Robertson also contends for Marlowe as author of A Shrew. Referring to the hypothesis of Fleay just quoted, he dismisses that part of it relating to Shakespeare's hand in the 'old play': it is dismissed without argument. Robertson tends to favour Dugdale Sykes' attribution of the prose scenes of A Shrew to Samuel Rowley (see infra). The verse scenes he claims as Marlowe's, although he admits to having had qualms about this earlier. Referring to the direct quotation from Dr Faustus sc. iii, 1-4 in the Induction in A Shrew ('Now that the gloomie shaddow of the night, etc.'), he admits that it looks like parody: but he regards as the decisive consideration the fact that the writing goes on in the very style of Marlowe; passages not lifted from Marlowe plays present stylistic features which are markedly Marlovian, -- a vigorous, fluent style, freely, not rigidly, iambic, but with end-stopped lines and stress on the last syllable. Robertson asserts that the imitations of Marlowe by Lodge, Greene, Peele, etc., consist of echoes of phrase and line, or short turgid flights in the Marlowe manner: but none of them have passages of any length so obviously Marlovian as long passages in A Shrew.

Can Marlowe indeed have parodied himself in parts of A Shrew? Quiller-Couch has a very pretty suggestion to make (New Shakespeare: The Shrew, intro. p. xxii-xxiii): he says, of A Shrew

But then, did Marlowe himself write it, with or without

collaborators? To the more seriously minded this suggestion may appear incredible. But to those acquainted with stage-folk and their ways there is nothing incredible about it. Marlowe's was a mocking spirit; and one can, without any grave stretch of belief, imagine that after a thundering success with Tamburlaine he (and maybe some kindred spirits) would have exploited its success by 'guying' his own bombast. As a theatrical, and commercial, hit the intrusion, upon a heath-side pot-house, of a master of hounds who, to the amazement of his hunt, suddenly breaks into grandiose lines upon the 'Shadow of the Night long-ing to view Orion's drizzling looks', might well have tickled ears that remembered them in a high tragic setting.

Such a theory might agree with Bullen's remark that "the inept introduction of some of the classical allusions looks more like a burlesque" of Marlowe. But the view that Marlowe composed at least the verse-scenes of A Shrew seems to me vitiated by the very ineptness of the introduction of some of these Marlowe quotations. They appear to me as clumsy and incongruous rather than as good burlesque:<sup>1</sup> the verse-scenes as a whole read more like someone trying to reach Marlowe's level than as Marlowe mocking at himself. Boas does well to lay stress on this

- 
1. See A. H. Bullen, Works of Marlowe (1885) Vol. I pp. lxxiv-lxxvi. "The Taming of a Shrew contains a number of passages that closely resemble, or are identical with, passages in Marlowe's undoubted plays - particularly Tamburlaine. This fact alone would make us suspect that Marlowe was not the author; for poets of Marlowe's class do not repeat themselves in this wholesale manner. But when we see how maladroitly, without the slightest regard to the context, these passages are introduced, then we may indeed wonder that any critic could have been so insensate as to attribute the authorship to Marlowe..... In my judgment the anonymous writer was sometimes engaged in imitating Marlowe and sometimes in burlesquing him. But be this as it may, the absurdity of attributing the piece to Marlowe is flagrant." Bullen also points out that the author of A Shrew was a genuine humourist; Marlowe had little or no humour.

ineptitude (Shakespeare Classics series: A Shrew, intro. p. xxx-xxxii). He says, for example:

...the more narrowly the borrowings are scrutinised in relation to their source, the less credit do they throw upon their conveyer. In some cases they convict him of curious ignorance of mythological lore, and in others they are grotesquely inappropriate to their new context. Thus in the Induction, ii. 20-1, Pegasus is spoken of as the horse "that ran so swiftly o'er the Persian plains". The dramatist seems to have thought that because Pegasus is mentioned by Tamburlaine, and because in the next line garments of "Median silke" are spoken of, that he was a Persian steed. Again, Marlowe makes the Soldan of Egypt swear appropriately by "Ibis holy name". The author of A Shrew not only puts a similar vow, with ridiculous incongruity, into the mouth of Ferando, but gives Ibis the fictitious attribute of a golden beak. Equally absurd on Ferando's lips is the reference..to "the massy robe" of "the stately legate of the Persian King", which is compounded out of two allusions in Tamburlaine. And even if Ferando's high-flown Marlowesque address to Kate be looked upon merely as banter, nothing could be more grotesque than his comparison of her later, in a soliloquy, to

"..the Thracian horse Alcides tam'd,

That King Egeus fed with flesh of men."

Even on the lips of Tamburlaine, as addressed to the captive kings harnessed to his chariot, the comparison is incongruously extravagant; but in its new application it is a piece of sheer absurdity.

Had Marlowe wished to give his own bombast he could have done so incomparably more effectively. Chambers's view is much more probable: "It looks as if someone, conscious of his own poetic insufficiency, had attempted to heighten his style by deliberate imitation and even plagiarism" (William Shakespeare, Vol. I, p.325). That the large number of borrowings direct from Marlowe, and the awkwardness of the new setting given to some of them, exempts Marlowe from the list of those who might be held responsible for the verse-scenes in A Shrew, is the view of Bullen, Chambers, Boas and Warwick Bond (Chambers, Boas: op. et loc.

cit.: Bullen and Bond -- see Arden The Shrew, intro. p. xxxix). It is a reasonable view. I cannot accept Robertson as proving more than what is always granted, viz. that the verse of A Shrew is a very close imitation of Marlowe. And before arriving at the conclusion stated in Vol. ii of The Shakespeare Canon (published in 1923) the same critic had held that whereas Marlowe himself might be involved, "the wholesale quotation and imitation of Marlowe might have been done by Greene" (Shakespeare and Chapman, 1917, p.237). The fact is we can go no further than to say that the verse of A Shrew seems to be imitated from Marlowe, and that there are considerations which render it extremely improbable that Marlowe himself had a hand in it.

KYD'S HAND IN 'A SHREW'?

Fleay subsequently abandoned the theory set forth in his Shakespeare Manual (1876). In his Life of Shakespeare (1886) he attributed A Shrew to Kyd (see pp. 21-3, 46, 226). His reason (all too slender) is given in his Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama (1891), pp. 31-33: I give the outline of the relevant part of his argument.

In the Address which he prefixed to Greene's Menaphon (1589) Nashe attacks Kyd ('the Kid in Aesop'), who is the author of a Hamlet. Marlowe is also attacked (for this Fleay gives no argument). Nor do the actors of these men's plays escape vituperation -- the 'vain glorious tragedians' who think to share poets' immortality "if they but once get Boreas by the beard, and the heavenly Bull by the dewlap". Now in Menaphon itself Doron, the representative of the vain glorious tragedians' "idiot art-masters" (i.e. the playwrights Nashe attacks), says "We had a Ewe among our Rams, whose fleece was as white as the hairs that grow on father Boreas' chin, or as the dangling dewlap of the Silver Bull; her front curled like to the Erimanthian Boar, and spangled like to the worsted stockings of Saturn; her face like Mars treading upon the milk-white clouds; her eyes were like the fiery torches tilting against the moon". Fleay expresses agreement with Richard Simpson's contention that there is a reference here to a line in A Shrew, viz. "Or icy hair that grows on Boreas' chin": he gives no citation, but I presume he



refers to Simpson's paper on Some Plays Attributed to Shakespeare in the Transactions of the New Shakespeare Society, 1875-6, pp. 155-180 (see p. 167 for this particular point). Fleay's reasoning seems to be this: Doron, the representative in the Menaphon itself of the 'vain glorious tragedians' or 'their idiot art-masters' whom Nashe attacks in the Address and whom Fleay identifies as Marlowe and Kyd, quotes (inexactly) a line from A Shrew. Why then Kyd as the author of that play, and not Marlowe? Fleay notes a similarity between Doron's speech above and a passage in Hamlet:

Hyperion's curls, the front of Jove himself,  
An eye like Mars, etc.

(III iv 56 ff.)

As on the evidence of Nashe's Address Kyd, and not Marlowe, was the author of the old Hamlet, Doron's reference is presumably to Kyd, and the similarity of his words and this passage in Shakespeare's Hamlet "only shows that Shakespeare had retained hints from Kyd's play, on which he founded his own some dozen years after".

This is an extremely tenuous case, and I know of no other critic who has accepted it. In the first place, that this line in A Shrew resembles words spoken by Greene's Doron may well be pure coincidence. In the second place, all critics are not agreed that Nashe attributes the early Hamlet to Kyd: (see the first part of the section on Hamlet in this work). It would take very little ingenuity to make Fleay's case fit Marlowe. In the third place, even granting that the line in question may be

Kyd's, it may be a borrowing in A Shrew, just as there are many borrowings from Marlowe. Why should the hypothesis of a lost play be an "imbecile resource"? In the fourth place, would Kyd plagiarise from Marlowe in so wholesale a fashion as did the author or authors of A Shrew? Boas (ed. A Shrew, p. xxxiii) considers this most unlikely, and I agree. It is true, as Boas remarks, that "the able plot-construction, the acidulated humour of some of the prose scenes, the device of a play within the play are all characteristic of the author of the Spanish Tragedy": but Kyd had no monopoly of these things. One cannot ascribe a play which has a play within the play to Kyd, simply because the Spanish Tragedy has one!

GREENE'S HAND IN 'A SHREW'?

Malone thought that the imitator of Marlowe whom we are seeking might be Peele or Greene: Knight chose Greene. Boas (ed. A Shrew, intro.), while rejecting this theory, admits that the case is somewhat stronger than that for certain other ascriptions. Greene "in Alphonsus and Orlando Furioso has obviously imitated the style and diction of Marlow": in Alphonsus he "reproduced almost literally individual lines", though he did not "transfer connected passages from Marlowe's dramas, nor violate congruity so outrageously in his borrowings". It was this fact which impelled Robertson to reject Greene as author of A Shrew (Shakespeare Canon, vol II, pp. 134 ff.).

Knight considered that Shakespeare's adaptation of this work of Greene's was the chief occasion of the latter's attack, in the Groatsworth of Wit (1592), on the "upstart crow beautified with our feathers" (Shakespeare). But Alexander (Henry VI and Richard III, pp. 39 ff.) has shown the probability that Greene was not accusing Shakespeare of plagiarism from him at all: he was attacking him and others like him as actors who took the applause which he considered should rightly go to the author of the play performed. "Greene had a long standing grievance against actors, and had already in 1590, in his Never Too Late, complained that the performer, who merely repeats the lines of an abler brain, makes far more than the author; and he addressed one individual in terms which are very similar...

Why Roscius, art thou proud with Esops Crow, being pranced  
with the glorie of other feathers?"

(Alexander, op. cit. p.43). Of the application of this latter passage there can be little doubt (cf. Roscius, feathers): and the similarity to the "upstart crow beautified with our feathers" renders Alexander's argument a strong one. If accepted, it removes from the field one argument which had been used to suggest Greene's authorship of A Shrew.<sup>1</sup>

Consider also the fact that "lines in it (i.e. A Shrew) seem to be satirised in Greene's Menaphon (1589) and Nashe's epistle thereto, but these may be among the borrowings (in A Shrew)" (Chambers, William Shakespeare, Vol. I, p.325: see the reference to Boreas in the section on Kyd above). If we were to agree that Doron does in the Menaphon allude to the line in A Shrew about the icy hairs on father Boreas' chin, we would be automatically releasing Greene from any claim that he might have to the authorship of A Shrew, for he would hardly borrow in a play of his lines of which he disapproved, any more than he would satirise a line of his own invention.

- 
1. Courthope, who attributed A Shrew to Shakespeare (as we shall see), thought that in A Groatworth of Wit Greene did accuse Shakespeare of copying: but he thinks the language of Greene's attack far too mild to have reference to the huge debt owed by 2 and 3 Henry VI to the Whole Contention (the whole structure and design, and thousands of lines). Courthope interprets Greene's attack thus: he is warning Peele and Marlowe not to rely on their favour with the public; he warns them that Shakespeare has copied the new blank verse style which the three of them introduced to the drama, and that he seems likely to supplant them in popularity. See History of English Poetry, Vol. iv, p. 460.

SHAKESPEARE'S HAND IN 'A SHREW'?

a. A 'First Sketch'?

Pope reluctantly came to the conclusion that A Shrew was an early Shakespearian work; the deciding factor was the 'manifestly better end' of A Shrew, the Sly framework being complete there and incomplete in The Shrew. And the German critic Tieck also considered A Shrew a youthful work of Shakespeare's.

The most elaborate argument towards this conclusion is that of Courthope, in the 4th volume of his History of English Poetry (1916): see pp. 75-8, 466-8.

A Shrew is, in Courthope's view, Shakespeare's first essay in comedy, written while he was under the influence of Marlowe. He claims unity of authorship for it, in terms which I cannot but think not a little uncritical: A Shrew, he says, "is obviously the work of one mind"; there is no "incongruity in the sentiment and diction". One can only reply that to oneself it does not seem so: A Shrew is not obviously homogeneous, as Bond (Arden The Shrew, p. xlii) and Dugdale Sykes (Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama, p. 53) point out. There is a distinct stylistic cleavage between the verse-scenes and the prose-scenes.

Courthope's argument as to the authorship of A Shrew proceeds out of that concerning the authorship of the First Part of the Contention and the True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York. Malone had held that these were non-Shakespearian and that Shakespeare had re-written them into II and III Henry VI. This



involves supposing that Shakespeare, in this re-writing, retained a very large number of lines by his predecessor: in fact, that Shakespeare was a plagiarist. Grant White had computed that more than 3,400 lines in II and III Henry VI were taken directly from, or at least based upon, passages in the Whole Contention. The idea of Shakespeare as a plagiarist does not appeal to Courthope: so he absolves him by maintaining that he was revising his own work. Precisely the same argument is used against A Shrew. A certain amount of The Shrew resembles A Shrew very closely indeed: unless we suppose that Shakespeare simply lifted another man's lines, we must consider A Shrew Shakespeare's own earlier work. It is not a little unfortunate that Courthope, in absolving Shakespeare from direct plagiarism in the wooing and taming of Katharina in The Shrew, should thereby (maintaining unity of authorship for A Shrew) convict him of by no means inconsiderable plagiarism from Marlowe: His theory that Shakespeare's A Shrew was written in his "Marlowe period" explains the Marlowesque manner and tone, but plagiarism from Marlowe is also present and cannot be glossed over. Courthope makes use of a quotation from Grant White in which the existence of liftings from Marlowe is pointed out (p. 467); but he makes absolutely no comment on this. He has cleared Shakespeare of a crime, and in the process has convicted him of the same crime. I wonder whether he would have suggested that the crime was less heinous in the younger man?

But to do Courthope justice the fact that the two texts

are so close in places, particularly the Petruchio-Katharina scenes, is remarkable. If A Shrew is indeed the 'older play' behind The Shrew, and if Shakespeare himself had no hand in it, he has certainly retained an extraordinarily great amount of his predecessor's work in these scenes. And it is the Petruchio-Katharina scenes which, along with Christopher Sly, which are in The Shrew the most lively and vitally Shakespearian! Sly, Petruchio, Grumio, and Katharina are without doubt the most alive characters in The Shrew: yet, if A Shrew is the source-play and non-Shakespearian, Shakespeare has found them, and much of what they say, ready-made in the work of an earlier unknown writer, while he has gone to the trouble of radically altering the sub-plot -- completely re-writing it -- although it is evident from The Shrew that this part of the play interested him far less than the other! It is indeed a pretty problem.

Walter Raleigh (Shakespeare, pp. 110-2) also suggests that A Shrew was written by Shakespeare; he is more cautious than Courthope (see e.g. Raleigh, p. 111 foot). He is particularly impressed by the Shakespearian quality of the comic scenes, and their nearness to those of The Shrew. He also points out the Shakespearian quality of portions of the Sly framework not found in the Folio (e.g. "We'll have no sending to prison"). He would attribute the Marlowesque verse to the young Shakespeare also.

b. Shakespeare as Joint-Author?

One might disagree with Courthope when he asserts unity of authorship for A Shrew, the author of the whole being Shakespeare, and yet be prepared to admit the possibility that, while some other writer was responsible for the lovers' sub-plot, the prose-scenes are Shakespeare's, very slightly re-modelled in The Shrew. We have seen that Fleay's first hypothesis was that Marlowe wrote the verse-scenes in A Shrew and Shakespeare the prose-scenes; and that the revision which produced The Shrew was undertaken by Lodge, who re-wrote Marlowe's part, and Shakespeare, who slightly re-wrote his own. There is no need to discuss at this point the unity or otherwise of the authorship of The Shrew: a critic so sceptical of the 'disintegration of Shakespeare' as Sir Edmund Chambers believes that in The Shrew Shakespeare had, unusually for him, a collaborator (see William Shakespeare, Vol. I, p. 324). Conspicuous amongst earlier upholders of the theory of joint-authorship of The Shrew are Fleay (Transactions of the New Shak. Soc., 1874, pp. 85 ff.) and J. M. Robertson (Shakespeare and Chapman, pp. 226 ff.). On the other hand E. P. Kuhl (P.M.L.A., Vol. 40 (1925) pp. 551-618) has shown how inextricably the so-called 'Shakespearian' and 'non-Shakespearian' portions are bound up together; and the New Cambridge editors accept singleness of authorship (ed. The Shrew, intro. pp. x-xii). This does not primarily concern us here, because the passages in The Shrew which correspond very closely with A Shrew are included in those portions of the former which are never assailed as non-Shakespearian: thus

Fleay (Manual, p. 185), mainly on grounds of (i) metrical differences, and (ii) the differences in the manner of the introduction of classical allusions, limits Shakespeare's share of The Shrew to these passages:-

- II i 168-326 (the first interview between Petruchio and Kate).
- III ii (the arrival of Petruchio for the wedding, the report of the ceremony, and the departure of Petruchio and Kate):
- IV i (the 'beef and mustard' episode):
- IV iii (the haberdasher and the tailor):
- IV v (the 'moon/sun' controversy, and the greeting of Vincentio as a woman):
- V ii (except for ten lines at the end).

Much of IV i and IV iii corresponds very closely indeed with A Shrew; and there are correspondences, more or less frequent and close, at other points in the above list. With Fleay's limitation of Shakespeare's work in The Shrew I cannot agree: but the point to be noticed is that where The Shrew corresponds most closely with A Shrew (i.e. the actual taming-scenes in Act IV) the most uncompromising disintegrator of The Shrew admits the presence in it of Shakespeare's hand.<sup>1</sup> So, unless Shakespeare was himself, in younger days, responsible for at least those portions of A Shrew, he does stand convicted of plagiarism.

---

1. The only exception in Fleay's analysis is the Induction, which he regards as non-Shakespearian in The Shrew, and in which there are verbal correspondences with that of A Shrew: these are not, however, so close as those in Act IV.

As regards the sub-plot the position is different; its lines of development are not those of The Shrew, and verbal contacts between the two texts are practically non-existent. And there is in A Shrew a most decided stylistic cleavage between the two sets of scenes. Thus other critics beside Fleay have given to Shakespeare a varying amount of the material in the taming-scenes of A Shrew (i.e. in those scenes where there is close contact between the two texts), while attributing the remainder of that play to some other author.

Recent criticism has been most cautious in this matter. Thus Warwick Bond would "admit the possibility of his (Shakespeare) having had a hand in A Shrew.....because I feel the Induction to be so vigorous and natural a piece of imaginative work and the conception of Kate and Ferando so powerful and humorous.....that one knows not to whom to attribute these creations if not to Shakespeare. And the extreme closeness of reproduction of the taming action in the later piece, by an author so original as Shakespeare, of course increases the probability" (Arden ed. The Shrew, pp. xli-xlii). But he emphasises the self-evident stylistic difference between the verse of the taming portion of A Shrew and that which treats of the loves of Aurelius and Polidor: and he considers the verse of the taming portion itself unlike the verse of Shakespeare. So he is extremely wary about the extent of Shakespeare's share in A Shrew, if any.

Quiller-Couch (New Camb. The Shrew, intro. p. xxii) would



absolve Shakespeare from any share in the composition of A Shrew, "were it not for just one touch which winds up Sly's interposition in the finale....., which interposition, by the way, gets the comedy out of a bad impasse, and is in the right Warwickshire-Dogberry vein".

With the views of these two critics compare that of W. C. Hazlitt, who says of A Shrew that its interest for us "is enhanced by the more than possibility that in its original shape it received certain touches from Shakespeare's hand at the time when he was bestowing a considerable share of his attention on the alteration of existing dramas, before he entered on the composition of pieces, in which he depended chiefly on the inspiration of his own genius" (Hazlitt's ed. of Shakespeare's Library, Part I Vol. iv, p. 402). But they would not attribute very much of A Shrew to Shakespeare, and would deny the homogeneity which Courthope claimed for the entire text.

THE PARALLEL PASSAGES  
in 'A SHREW' and 'THE SHREW'.

Having surveyed the work of critics who believe that A Shrew is a 'source' of the Shakespearian play we must now consider another view -- that A Shrew represents an attempt at a memorial reconstruction of The Shrew. But first, for the sake of convenience, I shall give a parallel-text arrangement of those passages in the two Shrew plays which correspond closely. Thereafter I shall give a list of all the parallel phrases, so that the intimate relationship between certain portions of the two texts can be immediately appreciated. The parallel-text arrangement is necessary in addition to this list, which might give a false impression if the reader were not able also to see the differences between the corresponding portions of the texts.

The portions of the two plays of which I shall give parallel texts are these:

- I. The Induction.
- II. The two episodes connected with the starvation of Katherine, i.e. (i) IV i 109-201 (ii) IV iii 1-60, and the corresponding passages in A Shrew.
- III. The scene involving the Tailor and Haberdasher, i.e. IV iii 61-194 and the corresponding passage in A Shrew.
- IV. The "sun/moon" controversy, i.e. IV v 1-26 and the corresponding passage in A Shrew.

A Shrew (Induction): Shakespeare's Library (W.C.Hazlitt ed.)  
Part II vol. ii pp. 492-5.

Enter a Tapster, beating out of his doores Slie  
Droonken.

Tap. You whorson droonken slaue, you had best be gone,  
And empty your droonken panch some where else  
For in this house thou shalt not rest this night.  
(Exit Tapster.)

Sli. Tilly, vally, by crisee Tapster Ile fese you anon.  
Fils the tother pot and all paid for, looke you  
I doo drink of mine owne Instegation, Omme bene  
Heere Ile lie awhile, why Tapster I say,  
Fils a fresh cushen heere.  
Heigh ho, heers good warme lying. (He fals asleepe.)

Enter a Nobleman and his men from hunting.

Lord. Now that the gloomie shaddow of the night,  
Longing to view Orions drisling lookes,  
Leapes from th'antarticke world vnto the skie,  
And dims the Welkin with her pitchie breath,  
And darkesome night oreshades the christall heauens,  
Here breake we off our hunting for to night;  
Cupple vppe the hounds and let vs hie vs home,  
And bid the huntsman see them meated well,  
For they haue all deseru'd it well to daie,  
But soft, what sleepeie fellow is this lies heere?  
Or is he dead, see one what he dooth lacke?

Seruimgman. My lord, 'tis nothing but a drunken sleepe,  
His head is too heauie for his bodie,  
And he hath drunke so much that he can go no further.

Lord. Fie, how the slauish villaine stinkes of drinke.  
Ho, sirha arise. What so sound asleepe?

Go take him vppe and beare him to my house,  
And beare him easilie for feare he wake,  
And in my fairest chamber make a fire,  
And set a sumptuous banquet on the boord,  
And put my richest garmentes on his backe,  
Then set him at the Table in a chaire:

When that is doone against he shall awake,  
Let heauenlie musicke play about him still,  
Go two of you awaie and beare him hence.

And then Ile tell you what I haue deuisde, 35  
But see in any case you wake him not. (Exeunt two with Slie.  
Now take my cloake and gyue me one of yours,  
All fellows now, and see you take me so,  
For we will waite vpon this droonken man,  
To see his countenance when he dooth awake  
And finde him selfe clothed in such attire,  
With heauenlie musicke sounding in his eares,  
And such a banquet set before his eies,  
The fellow sure will thinke he is in heauen,  
But we will be about him when he wakes,

# The Shrew, Induction, Scene i.

*Enter Hostess and Sly*

*Sly.* I'll pheeze you, in faith.

*Ho.* A pair of stocks, you rogue!

*Sly.* Y' are a baggage, the Slys are no rogues. Look in the chronicles; we came in with Richard Conqueror. Therefore paucas pallabris, let the world slide: sessa!

*Ho.* You will not pay for the glasses you have burst?

*Sly.* No, not a denier. Go by, S. Jeronimy, go to thy cold bed, and warm thee.

*Ho.* I know my remedy, I must go fetch the third-borough. *Exit*

*Sly.* Third, or fourth, or fifth borough, I'll answer him by law: I'll not budge an inch, boy: let him come, and kindly. *Falls asleep*

*Wind horns. Enter a Lord from hunting, with his train*

*Lor.* Huntsman, I charge thee, tender well my hounds: Brach Merriman, the poor cur is emboss'd;

And couple Clowder with the deep-mouth'd brach.

Saw'st thou not, boy, how Silver made it good

At the hedge-corner, in the coldest fault?

I would not lose the dog for twenty pound.

*1.H.* Why, Belman is as good as he, my lord;

He cried upon it at the merest loss,

And twice to-day pick'd out the dullest scent;

Trust me, I take him for the better dog.

*Lor.* Thou art a fool: if Echo were as fleet,

I would esteem him worth a dozen such.

But sup them well and look unto them all;

To-morrow I intend to hunt again.

*1.H.* I will, my lord.

*Lor.* What's here? one dead, or drunk? See doth he breathe?

*2.H.* He breathes, my lord. Were he not warm'd with ale, This were a bed but cold to sleep so soundly.

*Lor.* O monstrous beast! how like a swine he lies!

Grim death, how foul and loathsome is thine image!

Sirs, I will practise on this drunken man.

What think you, if he were convey'd to bed,

Wrapp'd in sweet clothes, rings put upon his fingers,

A most delicious banquet by his bed,

And brave attendants near him when he wakes,

Would not the beggar then forget himself?

*1.H.* Believe me, lord, I think he cannot choose.

*2.H.* It would seem strange unto him when he wak'd.

*Lor.* Even as a flattering dream or worthless fancy.

Then take him up, and manage well the jest:

Carry him gently to my fairest chamber,

And hang it round with all my wanton pictures:

Balm his foul head in warm distilled waters,

And burn sweet wood to make the lodging sweet:

Procure me music ready when he wakes,

To make a dulcet and a heavenly sound;

And if he chance to speak, be ready straight

(And with a low submissive reverence)

Say 'What is it your honour will command?'

Let one attend him with a silver basin

Full of rose-water, and bestrew'd with flowers,

Another bear the ewer, the third a diaper,

And say 'Will't please your lordship cool your hands?'

Some one be ready with a costly suit,

With a Shrew 35 of. Ind.  
i 129: Anon I'll give thee  
more instructions.

And see you call him Lord at euerie word,  
 And offer him his horses to ride abroad,  
 And thou his hawkes and houndes to hunt the deere,  
 And I will aske what sutes he meanes to weare,  
 And what so ere he saith, see you doo not laugh,  
 But still persuade him that he is a Lord.

Enter one.

Mes. And it please your honour your plaiers be com  
 And doo attend your honours pleasure here.

Lord. The fittest time they could haue chosen out,  
 Bid one or two of them come hither straight,  
 Now will I fit myselfe accordinglie,  
 For they shall play to him when he awakes.  
 Enter two of the players with packs at their backs,  
 and a boy.

Now sirs, what store of plaies haue you?

San. Marrie my lord you maie haue a Tragicall  
 Or a comoditie, or what you will. 60

The other. A Comedie thou shouldst say, souns thou't  
 shame vs all.

Lord. And whats the name of your Comedie?

San. Marrie my lord tis calde The taming of a shrew.  
 Tis a good lesson for vs my lord, for vs yt are  
 married men.

Lord. The taming of a shrew, thats excellent sure,  
 Go see that you make you readie straight,  
 For you must play before a lord to night,  
 Say you are his men and I your fellow,  
 Hees something foolish, but what so ere he saes,  
 See that you be not dasht out of countenance.  
 And sirha go you make you readie straight,  
 And dresse your selfe like some louelie ladie,  
 And when I call see that you come to me,  
 For I will say to him thou art his wife,  
 Dallie with him and hug him in thine armes,  
 And if he desire to goe to bed with thee,  
 Then faine some scuse and say thou wilt anon.  
 Be gone I say, and see thou doost it well.

Boy. Feare not my Lord, Ile dandell him well enough  
 And make him thinke I loue him mightilie. (Ex. Boy.)

Lord. Now sirs go you and make you ready to,  
 For you must play assoone as he dooth wake.

San. O braue, sirha Tom, we must play before  
 A foolish Lord, come lets go make us ready,  
 Go get a dishclout to make cleane your shooes,  
 And Ile speake for the properties, My Lord, we must  
 Haue a shoulder of mutton for a propertie,  
 And a little vinegre to make our Diuell rore.

Lord. Very well: sirha see that they want nothing.  
 (Exeunt Omnes.)

NOTE. The portion of A Shrew which corresponds to the 2nd scene  
 of the Induction of The Shrew contains so few verbal parallels  
 with the latter that I do not give parallel texts here. Such  
 verbal connections as there are are given in the list of par-  
 allels below.



With A Shrew 60 cf.  
Induction, ii, 136

it is not a comonty,

(probably to be emended to  
"commodity" as in A Shrew).

(Beginning with line 104)

He bear himself with honourable action,  
Such as he hath observ'd in noble ladies  
Unto their lords, by them accomplished :  
Such duty to the drunkard let him do  
With soft low tongue and lowly courtesy,  
And say, 'What is 't your honour will command,  
Wherein your lady and your humble wife  
May show her duty, and make known her love ?'  
And then with kind embracements, tempting kisses,  
And with declining head into his bosom,  
Bid him shed tears, as being overjoy'd  
To see her noble lord restor'd to health,  
Who for this seven years hath esteemed him  
No better than a poor and loathsome beggar :  
And if the boy have not a woman's gift  
To rain a shower of commanded tears,  
An onion will do well for such a shift,  
Which in a napkin (being close convey'd)  
Shall in despite enforce a watery eye.  
See this dispatch'd with all the haste thou canst,  
Anon I'll give thee more instructions.

*Exit a Servingman*

I know the boy will well usurp the grace,  
Voice, gait, and action of a gentlewoman :  
I long to hear him call the drunkard husband,

And how my men will stay themselves from laughter,  
When they do homage to this simple peasant,  
I'll in to counsel them ; haply my presence  
May well abate the over-merry spleen,  
Which otherwise would grow into extremes. *Exeunt*

And ask him what apparel he will wear ;  
Another tell him of his hounds and horse,  
And that his lady mourns at his disease :  
Persuade him that he hath been lunatic ;  
And when he says he is, say that he dreams,  
For he is nothing but a mighty lord.  
This do, and do it kindly, gentle sirs :

It will be pastime passing excellent,  
If it be husbanded with modesty.

*I.H.* My lord, I warrant you we will play our part,  
As he shall think by our true diligence  
He is no less than what we say he is.

*Lor.* Take him up gently, and to bed with him,  
And each one to his office when he wakes.

*Some bear out Sly. Sound trumpets*

Sirrah, go see what trumpet 'tis that sounds,

*Exit Servingman*

Belike, some noble gentleman that means,  
Travelling some journey, to repose him here.

*Re-enter Servingman*

How now ! who is it ?

*Ser.* An 't please your honour, players  
That offer service to your lordship.

*Lor.* Bid them come near.

*Enter Players*

Now, fellows, you are welcome.

*Players.* We thank your honour.

*Lor.* Do you intend to stay with me to-night ?

*A Player.* So please your lordship to accept our duty.

*Lor.* With all my heart. This fellow I remember,  
Since once he play'd a farmer's eldest son :  
'Twas where you woo'd the gentlewoman so well :

I have forgot your name ; but, sure, that part  
Was aptly fitted and naturally perform'd.

*A Player.* I think 'twas Soto that your honour means.

*Lor.* 'Tis very true : thou didst it excellent.

Well, you are come to me in happy time,  
The rather for I have some sport in hand,  
Wherein your cunning can assist me much.  
There is a lord will hear you play to-night :  
But I am doubtful of your modesties ;  
Lest (over-eyeing of his odd behaviour,  
For yet his honour never heard a play)  
You break into some merry passion,  
And so offend him ; for I tell you, sirs,  
If you should smile, he grows impatient.

*A Player.* Fear not, my lord : we can contain ourselves,  
Were he the veriest antic in the world.

*Lor.* Go, sirrah, take them to the buttery,  
And give them friendly welcome every one ;  
Let them want nothing that my house affords.

*Exit one with the Players*

Sirrah, go you to Barthol'mew my page,  
And see him dress'd in all suits like a lady :  
That done, conduct him to the drunkard's chamber ;  
And call him 'madam,' do him obeisance.  
Tell him from me, as he will win my love,

(ending with line 103)

II.

A Shrew sig. D3. Shak. Lib. Pt. II Vol. ii, p. 519.

Enter Ferando and Kate.

Fer. Now welcome Kate: where's these villains  
Here, what? not supper yet vpon the borde:  
Nor table spred nor nothing don at all,  
Wheres that villaine that I sent before.

San. Now, ad sum, sir.

Fer. Come hether you villaine Ile cut your nose, 6  
You Rogue: helpe me off with my bootes: wilt please  
You to lay the cloth? sounes the villaine  
Hurts my foote? pull easely I say; yet againe.  
(He beates them all. They couer the bord  
and fetch in the meate.  
Sounes? burnt and skorcht who drest this meate?

Will. Forsouth Iohn cooke.  
(He throwes downe the table and meate and  
all, and beates them.

Fer. Go you villaines bring you me such meate,  
Out of my sight I say and beare it hence,  
Come Kate wele haue other meate prouided,  
Is there a fire in my chamber sir? 15

San. I forsooth. (Exit Ferando and Kate.

Manent seruing men and eate vp all the meate.

The Shrew, IV i 109-68.

With A Shrew 6 cf. Vi 127:  
Vincentio: I'll slit the  
 villain's nose.....

With A Shrew 15 cf. IV i 4:  
Grumio: I am sent before to  
 make a fire.

(Beginning with line 155)

There, take it to you, trenchers, cups, and all:

*Throws the meat, &c., about the stage*

You heedless joltheads and unmanner'd slaves!

What, do you grumble? I'll be with you straight.

*Kat.* I pray you, husband, be not so disquiet,

The meat was well, if you were so contented.

*Pet.* I tell thee, Kate, 'twas burnt and dried away,

And I expressly am forbid to touch it;

For it engenders choler, planteth anger;

And better 'twere that both of us did fast,

Since of ourselves ourselves are choleric,

Than feed it with such over-roasted flesh.

Be patient, to-morrow 't shall be mended,

And for this night we'll fast for company:

Come, I will bring thee to thy bridal chamber.

*Exeunt*

*Re-enter Servants severally*

*Enter Petruchio and Katharina*

*Pet.* Where be these knaves? What, no man at door

To hold my stirrup, nor to take my horse?

Where is Nathaniel, Gregory, Philip?

*All Serv.* Here, here, sir; here, sir.

*Pet.* Here sir, here sir, here sir, here sir?

You logger-headed and unpolish'd grooms!

What? no attendance? no regard? no duty?

Where is the foolish knave I sent before?

*Gru.* Here sir, as foolish as I was before.

*Pet.* You peasant, swain, you whoreson malt-horse  
 drudge,

Did I not bid thee meet me in the park,

And bring along these rascal knaves with thee?

*Gru.* Nathaniel's coat, sir, was not fully made,

And Gabriel's pumps were all unpink'd i' the heel;

There was no link to colour Peter's hat,

And Walter's dagger was not come from sheathing:

There were none fine but Adam, Ralph, and Gregory;

The rest were ragged, old, and beggarly;

Yet, as they are, here are they come to meet you.

*Pet.* Go, rascals, go, and fetch my supper in.

*Exeunt Servants*

*(singing)* Where is the life that late I led—

Where are those—Sit down, Kate, and welcome.—

Food, food, food, food!

*Re-enter Servants with supper*

Why, when, I say? Nay, good sweet Kate, be  
 merry.

Off with my boots, you rogues! you villains, when?

*(sings)* It was the friar of orders grey,

As he forth walked on his way:—

Out, you rogue, you pluck my foot awry:

Take that, and mend the plucking of the other

*Strikes him*

Be merry, Kate. Some water, here; what, ho!

*Enter one with water*

Where's my spaniel Troilus? Sirrah, get you hence,

And bid my cousin Ferdinand come hither:

One, Kate, that you must kiss, and be acquainted  
 with.

Where are my slippers? Shall I have some water?

Come, Kate, and wash, and welcome heartily.

You whoreson villain, will you let it fall?

*Strikes him*

*Kat.* Patience, I pray you, 'twas a fault unwilling.

*Pet.* A whoreson beetle-headed, flap-ear'd knave!

Come, Kate, sit down; I know you have a stomach.

Will you give thanks, sweet Kate, or else shall I?

What's this? mutton?

*I.S.*

*Ay.*

*Pet.*

Who brought it?

*Peter.*

*I.*

*Pet.* 'Tis burnt, and so is all the meat.

What dogs are these? where is the rascal cook?

How durst you, villains, bring it from the dresser,

And serve it thus to me that love it not?

(ending with line 154)

A Shrew: Shak. Lib. Pt. II vol. ii pp. 519-20.

(Manent seruing men and eate vp all the meate)

Tom. Sounes! I thinke of my conscience my Masters  
Mad since he was maried.

Will. I laft what a boxe he gaue Sander  
For pulling of his bootes.

Enter Ferando againe.

San. I hurt his foot for the nonce man.

Fer. Did you so you damned villaine.

(He beates them all out againe.

This humor must I holde me to awhile,  
To bridle and holde backe my headstrong wife,  
With curbes of hunger: ease: and want of sleepe,  
Nor slepe nor meate shall she inioie to night,  
Ile mew her vp as men do mew their hawkes,  
And make her gentlie come vnto the lure,  
Were she as stuborne or as full of strength  
As were the Thracian horse Alcides tamde,  
That King Egeus fed with flesh of men,  
Yet would I pull her downe and make her come  
As hungry hawkes do flie vnto there lure. (Exit.

# The Shrew, IV i (cont<sup>d</sup>)

(lines 169-201.)

Re-enter Servants severally.

*Nat.* Peter, didst ever see the like?

*Peter.* He kills her in her own humour.

*Re-enter Curtis*

*Cur.* Where is he?

*Cur.* In her chamber, making a sermon of continency to her;

And rails, and swears, and rates, that she, poor soul,  
Knows not which way to stand, to look, to speak,

And sits as one new-risen from a dream.

Away, away! for he is coming hither.

*Exeunt*

*Re-enter Petruchio above*

*Pet.* Thus have I politicly begun my reign,  
And 'tis my hope to end successfully.  
My falcon now is sharp, and passing empty,  
And, till she stoop, she must not be full-gorg'd,  
For then she never looks upon her lure.  
Another way I have to man my haggard,  
To make her come, and know her keeper's call;  
That is, to watch her, as we watch these kites  
That bate, and beat, and will not be obedient:  
She ate no meat to-day, nor none shall eat;  
Last night she slept not, nor to-night she shall not;  
As with the meat, some undeserved fault  
I'll find about the making of the bed,  
And here I'll fling the pillow, there the bolster,  
This way the coverlet, another way the sheets:  
Ay, and amid this hurly I intend  
That all is done in reverend care of her,  
And, in conclusion, she shall watch all night,  
And if she chance to nod, I'll rail and brawl,  
And with the clamour keep her still awake:  
This is a way to kill a wife with kindness,  
And thus I'll curb her mad and headstrong humour.

He that knows better how to tame a shrew,

Now let him speak, 'tis charity to shew.

*Exit*



A Shrew, Shak. Lib. Pt. II vol. ii pp. 521-3.

Enter Sander and his Mistres.

San. Come Mistris.

Kate Sander I prethe helpe me to some meate,  
I am so faint that I can scarsely stande.

San. I marry mistris but you know my maister  
Has giuen me a charge that you must eate nothing,  
But that which he himselfe giueth you.

Kate Why man thy Maister needs never know it.

San. You say true indede: why looke you Mistris,  
What say you to a peese of beeffe and mustard now?

Kate Why I say tis excellent meate, canst thou  
helpe me to some?

San. I, I could helpe you to some but that  
I doubt the mustard is too colericke for you,  
But what say you to a sheepes head and garlick?

Kate Why any thing, I care not what it be.

San. I but the garlike I doubt will make your  
breath stincke,

And then my maister will course me for letting  
You eate it: But what say you to a fat Capon?

Kate That's meate for a King sweet Sander helpe  
Me to some of it.

San. Nay ber lady then tis too deere for vs, we  
must

Not meddle with the Kings meate.

Kate Out villaine dost thou mocke me,  
Take that for thy sawsinesse. (She beates him.

San. Sounes are you so light fingerd with a murrin,  
Ile keepe you fasting for it this two daies.

Kate I tell thee villaine Ile tear the flesh of  
Thy face and eate it and thou prates to me thus.

San. Here comes my Maister now hele course  
you.

Enter Ferando.....

The Shrew, IV iii 1-35.

Enter Katharina and Grumio.

*Gru.* No, no, forsooth, I dare not for my life.

*Kat.* The more my wrong, the more his spite appears :

What, did he marry me to famish me ?

Beggars, that come unto my father's door,

Upon entreaty have a present alms,

If not, elsewhere they meet with charity :

But I, who never knew how to entreat,

Nor never needed that I should entreat,

Am starv'd for meat, giddy for lack of sleep,

With oaths kept waking, and with brawling fed,

And that which spites me more than all these wants,

He does it under name of perfect love ;

As who should say, if I should sleep or eat,

'Twere deadly sickness, or else present death.

I prithee go, and get me some repast ;

I care not what, so it be wholesome food.

*Gru.* What say you to a neat's foot ?

*Kat.* 'Tis passing good, I prithee let me have it.

*Gru.* I fear it is too choleric a meat.

How say you to a fat tripe finely broil'd ?

*Kat.* I like it well, good Grumio, fetch it me.

*Gru.* I cannot tell, I fear 'tis choleric.

What say you to a piece of beef and mustard ?

*Kat.* A dish that I do love to feed upon.

*Gru.* Ay, but the mustard is too hot a little.

*Kat.* Why then the beef, and let the mustard rest.

*Gru.* Nay then, I will not ; you shall have the mustard,

Or else you get no beef of Grumio.

*Kat.* Then both, or one, or anything thou wilt.

*Gru.* Why then, the mustard and without the beef.

*Kat.* Go, get thee gone, thou false deluding slave,

*Beats him*

That feed'st me with the very name of meat :

Sorrow on thee, and all the pack of you

That triumph thus upon my misery !

Go, get thee gone, I say.

*Enter Petruchio and Hortensio with meat*

Enter Ferando with a peece of mete uppon his daggers  
point and Polidor with him.

Fer. Se here Kate I haue prouided meate for thee  
Here take it what ist not worthie thanks,  
Goe sirra? take it awaie againe you shal be  
Thankfull for the next you haue.

Kate Why I thanke you for it.

Fer. Nay now tis not worth a pin go sirray and  
take it hence I say.

San. Yes sir Ile Carrie it hence: Maister let her  
Haue none for she can fight as hungrie as she is.

Pol. I pray you sir let it stand, for Ile eate  
Some with her my selfe.

Fer. Well sirra set it downe againe.

Kate Nay nay I pray you let him take it hence,  
And keepe it for your owne diete for Ile none,  
Ile nere be beholding to you for your Meate,  
I tell thee flatlie here vnto thy teethe  
Thou shalt not keepe me nor feede me as thou list,  
For I will home againe vnto my fathers house;

Fer. I, when you'r meeke and gentell but not <sup>19</sup>  
Before, I know your stomack is not yet come downe,  
Therefore no maruell thou canste not eate,  
And I will goe vnto your fathers house;  
Come Polidor let vs goe in againe,  
And Kate come in with vs I know ere longe.  
That thou and I shall louingly agree. (Ex. Omnes. 25

The Shrew, IV iii 36-60.

(Enter Petruchio and Hortensio with meat).

*Pet.* How fares my Kate? What, sweeting, all amord?*Hor.* Mistress, what cheer?*Kat.* Faith, as cold as can be.*Pet.* Pluck up thy spirits, look cheerfully upon me.

Here, love, thou see'st how diligent I am,

To dress thy meat myself, and bring it thee:

I am sure, sweet Kate, this kindness merits thanks.

What, not a word? Nay then, thou lov'st it not;

And all my pains is sorted to no proof.

Here, take away this dish.

*Kat.* I pray you, let it stand.*Pet.* The poorest service is repaid with thanks,

And so shall mine be 'fore you touch the meat.

*Kat.* I thank you, sir.*Hor.* Signior Petruchio, fie! you are to blame:

Come, Mistress Kate, I'll bear you company.

*Pet.* Eat it up all, Hortensio, if thou lovest me.

Much good do it unto thy gentle heart!

Kate, eat apace: and now, my honey love,

Will we return unto thy father's house,

With A Shrew 19 cf. IV iii 71-2:*Pet.* When you are gentle, you  
shall have one too, / And not  
till then.With A Shrew 25 cf. V ii 1:*Lucentio:* At last, though  
long, our jarring notes  
agree.And revel it as bravely as the best,  
With silken coats and caps and golden rings,  
With ruffs and cuffs and farthingales and  
things;  
With scarfs and fans and double change of  
brav'ry,  
With amber bracelets, beads, and all this  
knav'ry.  
What, hast thou dined? The tailor stays thy  
leisure,  
To deck thy body in his ruffling treasure.

## III.

A Shrew, Shak. Lib. Pt. II vol. ii p. 525.

Enter Ferando and Kate and Sander.

San. Master the haberdasher has brought my  
Mistresse home hir cappe here.

Fer. Come hither sirra: what haue you there?

Hab. A veluet cappe sir and it please you.

Fer. Who spoake for it? didst thou Kate?

Kate. What if I did, come hither sirra, giue me  
The cap, Ile see if it will fit me.

(She sets it one hir head.)

Fer. O monstrous, why it becomes thee not, &

Let me see it Kate: here sirra take it hence

This cappe is out of fashion quite.

Kate. The fashion is good inough: belike you  
Meane to make a foole of me.

Fer. Why true he means to make a foole of thee

To haue thee put on such a curtald cappe,

Sirra begone with it.



The Shrew, IV iii 61-85.

With A Shrew 8 cf. V ii 121:  
Pet. Katharine, that cap of  
 yours becomes you not.

With The Shrew 71-2 cf. A Shrew  
 at an earlier point (Hazlitt,  
 p. 523): Kate For I will home  
 againe unto my fathers house;  
Fer. I, when you'r meeke and  
 gentell but not / Before....

171  
 172

IV iii 100+  
 104.

*Enter Tailor*

Come, tailor, let us see these ornaments;  
 Lay forth the gown.

*Enter Haberdasher*

What news with you, sir?

*Hab.* Here is the cap your worship did bespeak.

*Pet.* Why, this was moulded on a porringer,  
 A velvet dish: fie, fie! 'tis lewd and filthy,  
 Why, 'tis a cockle or a walnut-shell,  
 A knack, a toy, a trick, a baby's cap:  
 Away with it! come, let me have a bigger.

*Kat.* I'll have no bigger, this doth fit the time,  
 And gentlewomen wear such caps as these.

*Pet.* When you are gentle, you shall have one too,  
 And not till then.

*Hor. (aside)* That will not be in haste.

I'll none of it: hence! make your best of it.

*Kat.* I never saw a better-fashion'd gown,  
 More quaint, more pleasing, nor more commendable:  
 Belike you mean to make a puppet of me.

*Pet.* Why, true, he means to make a puppet of thee.

*Kat.* Why, sir, I trust I may have leave to speak,  
 And speak I will; I am no child, no babe:

Your betters have endur'd me say my mind,  
 And if you cannot, best you stop your ears.  
 My tongue will tell the anger of my heart,  
 Or else my heart concealing it will break,  
 And rather than it shall, I will be free,  
 Even to the uttermost as I please in words.

*Pet.* Why, thou say'st true, it is a paltry cap,  
 A custard-coffin, a bauble, a silken pic;  
 I love thee well in that thou lik'st it not.

*Kat.* Love me, or love me not, I like the cap,  
 And it I will have, or I will have none.

*Exit Haberdas*

Enter the Taylor with a gowne.

San. Here is the Taylor too with my Mistris gowne.

Fer. Let me see it Taylor: what with cuts and iaggies.

Sounes you villaine, thou hast spoiled the gowne

Tay. Why sir I made it as your man gaue me direction.

You may reade the note here.

Fer. Come hither sirra Taylor reade the note.

Tay. Item. a faire round compast cape.

San. I thats true.

Tay. And a large truncke sleeue.

San. Thats a lie maister. I sayd two truncke sleeues.

Fer. Well sir goe forward.

Tay. Item a loose bodied gowne.

San. Maister if euer I sayd loose bodies gowne,

Sew me in a seame and beate me to death,

With bottome of browne thred.

Tay. I made it as the note bad me.

San. I say the note lies in his throute and thou too

And thou sayst it.

Tay. Nay nay nere be so hot sirra, for I feare you not.

San. Doost thou heare Taylor, thou hast braued

Many men: braue not me.

Thou'st faste many men.

Tay. Well sir.

San. Face not me Ile neither be faste nor braued

At thy handes I can tell thee.

*Pet.* Thy gown? why, ay: come, tailor, let us see 't.  
O mercy, God! what masquing stuff is here?  
What's this? a sleeve? 'tis like a demi-cannon:  
What, up and down, carv'd like an apple-tart?  
Here's snip, and nip, and cut, and slish and slash,  
Like to a censer in a barber's shop:  
Why, what, a devil's name, tailor, call'st thou this?  
*Hor. (aside)* I see she's like to have neither cap nor gown.

*Tai.* You bid me make it orderly and well,  
According to the fashion, and the time.

*Pet.* Marry, and did; but if you be remember'd,  
I did not bid you mar it to the time.

Go, hop me over every kennel home,  
For you shall hop without my custom, sir:

I'll none of it: hence! make your best of it.

*Kat.* I never saw a better-fashion'd gown,  
More quaint, more pleasing, nor more commendable:  
Belike you mean to make a puppet of me.

*Pet.* Why, true, he means to make a puppet of thee.

*Tai.* She says your worship means to make a puppet of her.

*Pet.* O monstrous arrogance! Thou liest, thou thread,  
thou thimble,  
Thou yard, three-quarters, half-yard, quarter, nail,  
Thou flea, thou nit, thou winter-cricket, thou!  
Brav'd in mine own house with a skein of thread?  
Away, thou rag, thou quantity, thou remnant,  
Or I shall so be-mete thee with thy yard,  
As thou shalt think on prating whilst thou liv'st!  
I tell thee, I, that thou hast marr'd her gown.

*Tai.* Your worship is deceiv'd; the gown is made  
Just as my master had direction:

Grumio gave order how it should be done.

*Gru.* I gave him no order; I gave him the stuff.

*Tai.* But how did you desire it should be made?

*Gru.* Marry, sir, with needle and thread.

*Tai.* But did you not request to have it cut?

*Gru.* Thou hast fac'd many things.

*Tai.* I have.

*Gru.* Face not me: thou hast brav'd many men; brave  
not me; I will neither be fac'd nor brav'd. I say  
unto thee, I bid thy master cut out the gown, but I  
did not bid him cut it to pieces. Ergo, thou liest.

*Tai.* Why, here is the note of the fashion to testify.

*Pet.* Read it.

*Gru.* The note lies in 's throat if he say I said so.

*Tai. (reads)* 'Imprimis, a loose-bodied gown:'

*Gru.* Master, if ever I said loose-bodied gown, sew me in  
the skirts of it, and beat me to death with a bottom  
of brown thread; I said a gown.

*Pet.* Proceed.

*Tai. (reads)* 'With a small compassed cape:'

*Gru.* I confess the cape.

*Tai. (reads)* 'With a trunk sleeve:'

*Gru.* I confess two sleeves.

*Tai. (reads)* 'The sleeves curiously cut.'

*Pet.* Ay, there's the villany.

*Gru.* Error i' the bill, sir; error i' the bill! I commanded  
the sleeves should be cut out, and sew'd up again,  
and that I'll prove upon thee, though thy little  
finger be arm'd in a thimble.

*Tai.* This is true that I say, an I had thee in place where,  
thou shouldst know it.

*Gru.* I am for thee straight: take thou the bill, give me  
thy mete-yard, and spare not me.

*Hor.* God-a-mercy, Grumio! then he shall have no odds.

A Shrew, Shak. Lib. Pt. II vol. ii pp. 526-7.

Kate Come come I like the fashion of it well enough,  
 Heres more a do then needs Ile haue it, I  
 And if you do not like it hide your eies,  
 I thinke I shall haue nothing by your will.

Fer. Go I say and take it vp for your maisters vse.

San. Souns villaine not for thy life touch it not,  
 Souns take vp my mistris gowne to his  
 Maisters vse?

Fer. Well sir whats your conceit of it.

San. I haue a deeper conceite in it then you thinke  
 for, take vp my mistris gowne

To his maisters vse?

Fer. Tailor come hether; for this time take it  
 Hence againe, and Ile content thee for thy paines.

Tay. I thanke you sir. (Exit Taylor.

The Shrew, IV iii 153-66.

*Pet.* Well, sir, in brief, the gown is not for me.

*Gru.* You are i' the right, sir, 'tis for my mistress.

*Pet.* Go, take it up unto thy master's use.

*Gru.* Villain, not for thy life : take up my mistress' gown  
for thy master's use !

*Pet.* Why, sir, what's your conceit in that ?

*Gru.* O, sir, the conceit is deeper than you think for :  
Take up my mistress' gown to his master's use ! O,  
fie, fie, fie !

*Pet.* (*aside*) Hortensio, say thou wilt see the tailor paid.  
Go take it hence ; be gone, and say no more.

*Hor.* (*aside*) Tailor, I'll pay thee for thy gown to-morrow :  
Take no unkindness of his hasty words :  
Away ! I say ; commend me to thy master.

*Exit Tailor*



Fer. Come Kate we now will go see thy fathers house  
Euen in these honest meane abilliments,  
Our purses shall be rich our garments plaine,  
To shrowd our bodies from the winter rage,  
And thats inough, what should we care for more  
Thy sisters Kate to morrow must be wed,  
And I haue promised them thou shouldst be there  
The morning is well vp lets hast away,  
It will be nine a clocke ere we come there.

Kate. Nine a clock, why tis allreadie past two  
In the after noone by all the clocks in the towne.

Fer. I say tis but nine a clock in the morning.

Kate. I say tis two a clocke in the after noone.

Fer. It shall be nine then ere we go to your fathers,  
Come back againe we will not go to day.  
Nothing but crossing of me still,  
Ile haue you say as I doo ere you go.  
(Exeunt Omnes.)

---

IV.

do. p. 530.

Fer. Come Kate the Moone shines cleare to night  
Methinkes.

Kate. The moone? why husband you are deceiued.  
It is the sun.

Fer. Yet againe come backe againe it shall be  
The moone ere we come at your fathers.

Kate. Why Ile say as you say it is the moone.

Fer. Iesus saue the glorious moone.

Kate. Iesus saue the glorious moone.

Fer. I am glad Kate your stomack is come downe.  
I know it well thou knowest it is the sun,  
But I did trie to see if thou wouldst speake,  
And crosse me now as thou hast donne before,  
And trust me Kate hadst thou not named the moone,  
We had gon back againe as sure as death,  
But soft whose this thats comming here.

Enter the Duke of Cestus alone.

*Pet.* Well, come, my Kate ; we will unto your father's,  
Even in these honest mean habiliments :  
Our purses shall be proud, our garments poor ;  
For 'tis the mind that makes the body rich :  
And as the sun breaks through the darkest clouds,  
So honour peereth in the meanest habit.  
What, is the jay more precious than the lark,

Because his feathers are more beautiful ?  
Or is the adder better than the eel,  
Because his painted skin contents the eye ?  
O, no, good Kate ; neither art thou the worse  
For this poor furniture and mean array.  
If thou account'st it shame, lay it on me,  
And therefore frolic : we will hence forthwith,  
To feast and sport us at thy father's house ;  
Go, call my men, and let us straight to him,  
And bring our horses unto Long-lane end,  
There will we mount, and thither walk on foot.  
Let 's see, I think 'tis now some seven o'clock,  
And well we may come there by dinner-time.

*Kat.* I dare assure you, sir, 'tis almost two,  
And 'twill be supper-time ere you come there.

*Pet.* It shall be seven ere I go to horse :  
Look, what I speak, or do, or think to do,  
You are still crossing it. Sirs, let 't alone :  
I will not go to-day, and ere I do,  
It shall be what o'clock I say it is.

*Hor.* Why, so this gallant will command the sun. *Exeunt*

### The Shrew, IV v 1-26.

*Pet.* Come on, a God's name, once more toward our  
father's :

Good Lord, how bright and goodly shines the  
moon !

*Kat.* The moon ? the sun : it is not moonlight now.

*Pet.* I say it is the moon that shines so bright.

*Kat.* I know it is the sun that shines so bright.

*Pet.* Now, by my mother's son, and that's myself,  
It shall be moon, or star, or what I list,  
Or ere I journey to your father's house :  
Go on, and fetch our horses back again ;  
Evermore cross'd and cross'd, nothing but cross'd !

*Hor.* Say as he says, or we shall never go.

*Kat.* Forward, I pray, since we have come so far,  
And be it moon, or sun, or what you please :  
An if you please to call it a rush-candle,  
Henceforth I vow it shall be so for me.

*Pet.* I say it is the moon.

*Kat.* I know it is the moon.

*Pet.* Nay, then you lie : it is the blessed sun.

*Kat.* Then, God be bless'd, it is the blessed sun :  
But sun it is not, when you say it is not ;  
And the moon changes even as your mind.  
What you will have it nam'd, even that it is,  
And so it shall be so for Katharine.

*Hor. (aside)* Petruchio, go thy ways ; the field is won.

*Pet.* Well, forward, forward ! thus the bowl should run,  
And not unluckily against the bias.  
But, soft ! company is coming here.

*Enter Vincentio*

PARALLEL PHRASES in 'A SHREW' and 'THE SHREW'.

Induction and 'Taming-scenes'.

1. Induction: scene (i).

A Shrew

p. 492

line

4 Ile fese you anon.

p. 493

2 Cupple vppe the hounds

3 And bid the huntsman see them  
meated well

5-6 But soft, what sleepe fel-  
low is this lies heere?/  
Or is he dead, see one what  
he dooth lacke?

12 Go take him vppe

13 And beare him easilie

14 And in my fairest chamber  
make a fire,

11 What so sound asleepe?

16 And put my richest garmentes  
on his backe,

18-19 When that is doone against  
he shall awake,/Let heauen-  
lie musicke play about him  
still,

21 And then Ile tell you what I  
haue deuisde,

15 And set a sumptuous banquet on  
the boord,

29 And such a banquet set before  
his eies,

The Shrew

1 I'll feeze you, in faith.

15 tender well my hounds

17 And couple Clowder with....

27 But sup them well

30 What's here? one dead, or  
drunk? See, doth he breathe?

44 Then take him up

45 Carry him gently to my fairest  
chamber,

48 And burn sweet wood....

32 .....to sleep so soundly.

58 Some one be ready with a  
costly suit,

49-50 Procure me music ready  
when he wakes,/To make a  
dulcet and a heavenly sound;

129 Anon I'll give thee more in-  
structions.

38 A most delicious banquet  
by his bed,

A Shrew

31 But we will be about him when  
he wakes,

32 And see you call him Lord at  
euerie word,

p. 494.

5 But still perswade him that  
he is a Lord.

3 And I will aske what sutes he  
meanes to weare,

1-2 And offer him his horse to  
ride abroad,/And thou his  
hawkes and houndes to hunt  
the deere,

6-7 And it please your honour  
your plaiers be com/And doo  
attend your honours pleas-  
ure here.

9 Bid one or two of them come  
hither straight.

8 The fittest time they could  
haue chosen out,

14 comoditie

21 For you must play before a  
lord to night,

25 And sirha go you make you  
ready straight,/And dresse  
your selfe like some loulie  
ladie,

29 Dallie with him and hug him  
in thine armes,

The Shrew

39 And brave attendants near him  
when he wakes,

62-4 Persuade him that he hath  
been lunatic;/And when he  
says he is Sly, say that he  
dreams,/For he is nothing  
but a mighty lord.

59 And ask him what apparel he  
will wear; also sc. ii line  
4: What raiment will your  
honour wear today?

60 Another tell him of his hounds  
and horse, : also sc. ii  
lines 41-46, where horses,  
hawks, and hounds are mention-  
ed in that order.

76-7 An't please your honour,  
players/That offer service to  
your lordship. Also sc. ii  
128-9: Your honour's players  
...Are come to play.....

78 Bid them come near.

89 Well, you are come to me in  
happy time,

sc. ii 136 F Comontie (Pope read  
'commodity' with (Q) and F4:  
the emendation is made in the  
text of the New Camb. ed..

92 There is a lord will hear you  
play to-night;

104 Sirrah, go you to Barthol'mew  
my page,/And see him dressed  
in all suits like a lady;

118-9 ...kind embracements, tempt-  
ing kisses,/And with declining  
head into his bosom...

A Shrew

p. 495

1-2 And if he desire to goe to  
 bed with thee,/Then faine  
 some scuse and say thou  
 wilt anon.

14 ...sirha see that they want  
 nothing.

The Shrew

cf. sc. ii lines 117-124.

103 Let them want nothing...

---



Induction, scene ii.A Shrew

p. 496

line

4 .....am I a Lord?

7 seq. (Marlowe) And if your  
honour please to ride  
abroad,/Ile fetch you  
lustie steedes more swift  
of pace/Then winged  
Pegasus etc..

15 By the masse I thinke I am  
a Lord indeed,

p. 497

6 For she and I will go to bed  
anon.

7-8 May it please you, your hon-  
ours plaiers be come;/To  
offer your honour a plaie.

The Shrew.

68 An I a lord?

cf. 41-2

Or wilt thou ride? thy  
horses shall be trapped  
.....

72 Upon my life, I am a lord  
indeed,

117 Madam, undress you and come  
now to bed.

128-9 Your honour's players,  
hearing your amendment,/  
Are come to play a pleasant  
comedy,...

Cf. also sc. i lines 76-7  
above.

In view of the fact that both The Taming of a Shrew and Titus Andronicus were Pembroke plays I should be inclined to compare A Shrew, p. 496 line 24 ("To gratulate your honours safe return") with Titus I i 221 ("To gratify the good Andronicus, / And gratulate his safe return"): if A Shrew, or at any rate the Induction, is indeed a memorial reconstruction, the reporter(s) may have had the line from Titus in mind.

A Shrew sig. D3: Shak. Lib.  
Pt. II vol. ii p. 519.

The Shrew, IV i 109-68.

The first episode connected with the starvation of Katharina.

line

- |       |  |             |   |
|-------|--|-------------|---|
| 5     | Now welcome Kate   | 131         | Sit down, Kate, and welcome:<br>144 Come, Kate, and wash,<br>and welcome heartily |
| 5     | where's these villains/Here  | 109         | Where be these knaves   |
| 8     | Wheres that villaine that I<br>sent before   | 116         | Where is the foolish knave<br>I sent before?                                      |
|       | With this compare <u>The Shrew</u> IV i 4 where Grumio says "I am sent<br>before to make a fire...": in <u>A Shrew</u> p. 519 line 19 Ferando<br>asks "Is there a fire in my chamber sir?" |             |   |
| 9     | Now, ad sum, sir   | 117         | Here, sir,....  |
| 10    | Come hither you villaine ile<br>cut your nose, / You Rogue:  | cf. V i 127 | I'll slit the villain's<br>nose.  |
| 11    | helpe me off with my bootes:   | 134         | Off with my boots, you rogues!<br>you villains, when?                             |
| 12-13 | souns the villaine / Hurts<br>my foote?  | 137         | Out, you rogue! You pluck my<br>foot awry.  |
| 14    | Souns? burnt and skorcht,<br>who drest this meat?  | 151         | 'Tis burnt  |
|       |  | 153         | where the <u>dresser</u> is mentioned   |
|       |  | 160         | 'twas burnt and dried away.   |
| 15    | Iohn cooke   | 152         | the rascal cook   |

A Shrew, sig. D4r-Elr(top):  
Shak. Lib. Pt. II vol. ii,  
 pp. 521-3.

The Shrew, IV iii  
 1 - 59.

The second episode connected with the starvation of Katharina.

p. 521  
 line

20 I prethe helpe me to some  
 meate

27 What say you to....  
 also at p. 522 lines 2 & 6

27 What say you to a peese of  
 beeffe and mustard now?

p. 522

1 too colerick  
 (of the mustard)

3 Why any thing, I care not  
 what it be.

6 But what say you to a fat  
 capon?

19 what ist not worthie thankes

20 Goe sirra? take it awaie  
 againe

26 I pray you sir let it stand

p. 523

7 For I will home againe vnto  
 my fathers house  
 and:-

11 And I will goe vnto your  
 fathers house

15 I prithee go, and get me  
 some repast

17 & 23 What say you to..  
 20 How say you to.....

23 What say you to a piece of  
 beef and mustard?

19 too choleric  
 (of the neat's foot)  
 22 choleric  
 (of the fat tripe)

16 I care not what, so it be  
 wholesome food  
 29 ...or anything thou wilt

20 How say you to a fat tripe?

41 this kindness merits thanks.  
 What, not a word?

44 Here, take away this dish

44 I pray you let it stand  
 (different speaker)

53 now...Will we return unto thy  
 father's house

A Shrew

The Shrew  
IV iii

p.523

8 I, when you'r meeke and gentell  
but not / Before

Transferred from the Cap  
episode:  
71-2. See Hickson, No. 3.

9 I know your stomach is not yet  
come downe

Cf. IV i 148: Come Kate, sit  
down, I know you have a  
stomach

('stomach' used in different senses.)

14 thou and I shall louingly  
agree

Cf. V ii 1, where Lucentio says  
"At last, though long, our  
jarring notes agree", referring  
to the resolution of all the  
difficult situations of the  
play.

The Haberdasher and the Tailor.

A Shrew, pp. 525-7 (Hazlitt): The Shrew, IV iii 59 seq.

A Shrew

p. 525

line

17-18 Master the haberdasher  
has brought my/Mistresse  
home hir cappe here.

20 A veluet cappe

24 why it becomes thee not,

O monstrous

25 here sirra take it hence

Let me see it Kate:

26 This cappe is out of  
fashion quite.

27 The fashion is good enough:

27-8 belike you / Meane to  
make a foole of me.

29 Why true he means to make a  
foole of thee

30 such a curtald cappe,

31 Sirra begone with it.

p. 526

2 Let me see it Taylor:

what with cuts and iaggess

The Shrew

63 Here is the cap your worship  
did bespeak.  
(with this cf. also A Shrew  
p.525 line 21 "Who spoake  
for it?")

65 A velvet dish:...

Cf. V ii 121 "Katharine, that cap  
of yours becomes you not".

108 O monstrous arrogance!

163 Go take it hence (to the  
Tailor)

86 come, tailor, let us see't.

69 this doth fit the time,  
cf. also 95 'according to the  
fashion and the time',

97 'I did not bid you mar it to  
the time', and 101 'I never  
saw a better fashioned gown'.

103 Belike you mean to make a  
puppet of me.

104 Why, true, he means to  
make a puppet of thee.  
(Note that A Shrew misses the  
pun by reading 'foole').

81 it is a paltry cap....

68 Away with it  
cf. also 163 'Go take it hence,  
be gone,.....'.

86 come, tailor, let us see't

90 Here's snip and nip and cut  
and slish and slash,....  
cf. also 128 'I did not bid  
him cut it to pieces'.



A Shrew

- 3 thou hast spoiled the gowne
- 4 I made it as your man gaue me direction.
- 5 You may reade the note here
- 6 Come hither sirra Taylor reade the note
- 7 Item. a faire round compast cape.
- 8 I thats true
- 9 And a large truncke sleeue.
- 10 Thats a lie maister. I sayd two truncke sleeues.  
(See also The Shrew, 128 thou liest.
- 12 Item a loose bodied gowne.
- 13-5 Maister if euer I sayd loose bodies gowne,/Sew me in a seame and beate me to death, / With bottome of browne thred.
- 16 I made it as the note bad me
- 17-8 I say the note lies in his throute and thou too / And thou sayst it.
- 20-5 San. ...thou hast braued/  
Many men: braue not me./  
Thou'st faste many men./Tay.  
Well sir./San. Face not me  
Ile neither be faste nor  
braued./At thy handes I can  
tell thee.

The Shrew.

- 115 thou hast marred her gown
- 116-7 the gown is made / Just as my master had direction:
- 129 here is the note of the fashion to testify.
- 130 Read it.
- 137 With a small compassed cape
- 138 I confess the cape.  
Cf. also 147 This is true that I say.
- 139 With a trunk sleeve.
- 140 I confess two sleeves.  
Cf. also 143 Error i'th'bill .....  
I commanded....Cf. also
- 131 The note lies in's throat...
- 132 Imprimis, a loose-bodied gown.  
(It is obviously appropriate that the gown itself be mentioned before the parts.)
- 133-5 Master, if ever I said loose-bodied gown, sew me in the skirts of it, and beat me to death with a bottom of brown thread.
- Cf. 116-7, 129. Also 127 'I bid thy master cut out the gown, etc.'.
- 131 The note lies in's throat if he say I said so.
- 123-6 Gru. Thou hast faced many things./Tai. I have./Gru. Face not me: thou hast braved many men, brave not me; I will neither be faced nor braved.

A Shrew

26 I like the fashion of it well  
enough,  
Cf. references at line 27 above. 101.

27 Heres more a do then needs

Ile haue it

p. 527.

1 Go I say and take it vp for  
your maisters vse.

2-4 Souns villaine not for thy  
life touch it not,/ Souns  
take vp my mistris gowne  
to his / Maisters vse?

5 Well sir whats your conceit  
of it.

6-8 I haue a deeper conceite in  
it then you thinke for,  
take vp my mistris gowne/  
To his maisters vse?

9-10 take it / Hence againe,

The Shrew

Katharina's pacific tone  
here reminds one of her  
similar attempts at peace-  
making in The Shrew at IV  
i 146, 158-9.

84-5 I like the cap,/And it I  
will have.....

155 Go, take it up unto thy  
master's use.

156-7 Villain, not for thy life:  
take up my mistress' gown  
for thy master's use!

158 Why, sir, what's your conceit  
in that?

159-60 O, sir, the conceit is  
deeper than you think for:/  
Take up my mistress' gown  
to his master's use!

163 Go take it hence....

---

The Argument about the time of day, and the 'sun/moon' controversy.

A Shrew, Hazlitt, Pt. II vol. ii pp. 527 and 530: The Shrew, IV  
iii 167-194 and IV v 1-26.

A Shrew

p. 527  
line

12-14 Come Kate we now will go  
see thy fathers house/Euen  
in these honest meane abil-  
liments,/Our purses shall  
be rich our garments plaine,

19 The morning is well vp lets  
hast away,

20 It will be nine a clocke ere  
we come there

21 why tis alreadie past two

23-4 Fer. I say tis but nine...  
....Kate I say tis two....

25 It shall be nine then ere we  
go to your fathers,

26 we will not go to day.

27 Nothing but crossing of me  
still

28 Ile haue you say as I doo  
ere you go.

The Shrew

IV iii  
line

167-9 Well, come my Kate, we will  
unto your father's,/Even in  
these honest mean habiliments:  
/Our purses shall be proud,  
our garments poor:

A comparison might be suggest-  
ed with III ii 109 'The  
morning wears' and 185 'my  
haste doth call me hence'.

188 And 'twill be supper-time ere  
you come there.

187 'tis almost two

Cf. the sun/moon argument:-  
IV v 4-5 Petr. I say it is  
the moon.....Kate I know  
it is the sun.....

This corresponds to IV iii 189  
It shall be seven ere I go  
to horse: Cf. also 192-3  
and ere I do,/It shall be  
what o'clock I say it is:  
and IV v 7-8 It shall be moon,  
or star, or what I list, / Or  
ere I journey to your father's  
house. And IV iii 167 'we  
will unto your father's'.

192 I will not go today,

191 You are still crossing it.  
Cf. IV v 10 Evermore crossed and  
crossed.....

192-3 quoted above. Cf. also IV v  
11 Say as he says, or we  
shall never go.

A Shrew

p. 530

14 the Moone shines cleare to  
night / Methinkes.

16 The moone? why husband you  
are deceiued./ It is the  
sun.

18-9 it shall be/The moone ere  
we come at your fathers.

20 Why Ile say as you say it is  
the moone.

23 I am glad Kate your stomach  
is come downe.

29 But soft whose this thats  
comming here.

The Shrew

IV v

2 how bright and goodly shines  
the moon!

3 The moon! the sun: also 5  
I know it is the sun.  
Cf. in addition IV iii 115-7:  
Petr. thou hast marred her  
gown. Tailor Your worship  
is deceiued, the gown is  
made/Just as my master had  
direction...

7-8 It shall be moon..../Or ere I  
journey to your father's  
house. Cf. also IV iii 186  
'....we may come there by  
dinner-time', and 188 'ere  
you come there'. Also IV  
iii 167 'we will unto your  
father's'.

Cf. 11 Say as he says.....

Cf. V ii 176 'Then vail your  
stomachs'.

26 But soft, what company is  
coming here?

The final contest of wifely obedience.

A Shrew, Hazlitt Pt. II vol. ii pp. 536-41: The Shrew, V ii.

A Shrew

p.536

line

9-10 in triall of our wiues,/Who  
will come sownest at their  
husband's call.

17 My wife comes soonest for a  
hundred pound.

18-9 I lay as much to youres,/   
That my wife comes as soone  
as I do send.

27,9 And whose wife soonest  
comes when he doth call,/   
.... /Let him inioye the  
wager I haue laid,.....

23-4 why I haue layd as much/  
Vpon my dogge, in running  
at a Deere,

30 dare you aduenture thus?  
p.537, lines 12-3 Tush father  
were it ten times more,/I  
durst aduenture on my  
louely Kate,

p. 537

line

18 I promise thee Ferando I am  
afraid thou wilt lose.

19-21 Valeria/Go bid your Mis-  
tris come to me./Val. I  
will my Lord.

28-9 Now sirra what saies your  
mistris?/Val. She is some-  
thing busie but shele come  
anon.

p. 538

2 She is busie and cannot come.

The Shrew

67-9 And he whose wife is most  
obedient,/To come at first  
when he doth send for her,  
/Shall win the wager which  
we will propose.

Cf. also 74 -- "A hundred  
then" (i.e. crowns).

72-3 I'll venture so much of my  
hawk or hound, / But twenty  
times so much upon my wife.

Cf. 88-9 I am afraid, sir,/Do  
what you can, yours will  
not be entreated.

76 Go, Biondello, bid your mis-  
tress come to me.  
Bion. I go.

80-1 How now! what news?/Bion.  
Sir, my mistress sends you  
word/That she is busy, and  
she cannot come.

82-3 How! she is busy, and she  
cannot come!/Is that an  
answer?



A Shrew

- 3 I pray God your wife send  
you so good an answer
- 6 Boy desire your mistris to  
come hither. / Boy. I will  
sir.
- 8 I so so he desiers her to  
come.
- 13 Now wheres your Mistris?
- 14-5 She bad me tell you that  
she will not come/.....you  
must come to her.
- 16 Oh monstrous intollerable  
presumption,
- 20-1 Well sir I pray lets here  
what/Answere your wife  
will make.
- 22-3 Sirra command your Mistris  
to come / To me presentlie.
- 26 ....she will not come.
- 27 The mores the pittie:
- 28 For I haue won
- for see where Kate doth come.
- 29 ...did you send for me?

The Shrew

- 83-4 Is that an answer? -- Ay,  
and a kind one too:/Pray God,  
sir, that your wife send you  
not a worse.
- 86-7 Sirrah Biondello, go and  
entreat my wife/To come to  
me forthwith.  
Cf. also 76 above.
- 87 O, ho! entreat her!
- 90 Now where's my wife? Cf. also  
76, 80-1 ('your/my mistress')
- 92 She will not come; she bids  
you come to her.
- 93-4 O vile,/Intolerable, not to  
be endured! Cf. also IV iii  
108 "O monstrous arrogance!"  
Cf. 83-4 above. Also 97 'I know  
her answer.....'.
- 95-6 Sirrah Grumio, go to your  
mistress;/Say, I command her  
come to me.
- 97 She will not (sc. 'come' from  
line 96).
- 98 The fouler fortune mine,
- 112 The wager thou hast won,  
Cf. also 186 'Twas I won the  
wager....
- 99 here comes Katharina! Cf.  
also 119 See, where she  
comes (i.e. Katharina).
- 100 What is your will...that you  
send for me?

A Shrew

p. 539

line

3 my cap

4 Pull it of and treade it  
vnder thy feete,

6 O wounderfull metamorphosis

7 This is a wonder almost past  
beleefe.

8 a token of her true loue

10 where are thy sisters.

11 They be sitting in the  
bridall chamber.12-3 Fetch them hither and if  
they will not come,/Bring  
them perforce....23 ...making a foole of her  
selfe and vs.24-5 Beshrew thee Phylema, thou  
hast/Lost me a hundred  
pound to night.30-2 Now louely Kate before these  
husbands here,/I prethe tell  
unto these hedstrong women/  
What dutie wiues doo owe  
vnto their husbands.

p. 540.

24 Obey them, loue them

26-9 Laying our handes vnder their  
feete to tread,/If that by  
that we might procure there  
ease,/And for a president Ile  
first begin/And lay my hand  
under my husbands feete.The Shrew

121 that cap of yours

122 Off with that bauble, throw  
it under-foot.106 Here is a wonder,...  
Cf. also 115 For she is  
changed,.....106 Here is a wonder, if you talk  
of wonder.178 In token of which duty (i.e.  
duty to one's husband).  
Cf. also 108 'peace it bodes,  
and love'.101 Where is your sister, and  
Hortensio's wife?102 They sit conferring by the  
parlour fire.103-4 Go, fetch them hither. If  
they deny to come,/Swinge  
me them soundly forth....

125 ...a foolish duty....

127-8 The wisdom of your duty,  
fair Bianca,/Hath cost one  
hundred crowns since supper  
time.130-1 Katharine, I charge thee,  
tell these headstrong women/  
What duty they do owe their  
lords and husbands.

164 bound to...love, and obey.

177-9 And place your hands below  
your husband's foot:/In token  
of which duty, if he please,/My  
hand is ready, may it do  
him ease.

A Shrew

30 the wager thou hast won,  
(also 32)

p. 541

1-3 A hundred poundes I freely  
giue thee more,/Another  
dowry for another daughter,/For  
she is not the same she  
was before.

4 gentlemen godnight

6-7 Tis Kate and I am wed, and  
you are sped./And so fare-  
well for we will to our  
beds.

11 How now Polidor in a dump,

The Shrew

112 The wager thou hast won,

112-5 and I will add/Unto their  
losses twenty thousand crowns,  
/Another dowry to another  
daughter,/For she is changed,  
as she had never been.

187 God give you good night!

184-5 Come Kate, we'll to bed./  
We three are married, but  
you two are sped.

Cf. II i 277 'Why, how now,  
daughter Katharine! in your  
dumps?'

From these lists of parallels it is clear that Gollancz was quite wrong in claiming that "the old play (i.e. A Shrew) has been thoroughly transformed as far as diction and characterisation are concerned" (Old Temple ed. of The Shrew, p.viii). This is true of the sub-plot, but certainly not of those parts of the play from which our parallels are drawn.

---

Let us now proceed to the evidence on which is based the theory that the text of A Shrew post-dates that of The Shrew as found in the Folio.

HICKSON'S PARALLELS.

In Notes and Queries, series 1, vol. 1 (1849-50) pp. 345-7 Samuel Hickson produced evidence for the contention that "the Taming of the Shrew, by Shakespeare, is the original play; and that the Taming of A Shrew, by Marlowe or what other writer soever, is a later work, and an imitation". He points to certain parallel passages in the two texts, and argues that in these "the purpose, and sometimes even the meaning, is intelligible only in the form in which we find it in Shakespeare". The writer of A Shrew, attempting to recollect The Shrew at these points has failed to grasp the real significance of the words. The parallels cited are as follows: my references in the case of The Shrew are to the New Cambridge edition, and in the case of A Shrew to the signatures of the 1594 quarto and to the pages of Six Old Plays (SOP) and W. C. Hazlitt's reprint of Shakespeare's Library, Part II vol. 2 (SL).

1. The Shrew, IV iii 123-6:

Grumio. Thou hast faced many things.

Tailor. I have.

Grumio. Face not me: thou hast braved many men,  
Brave not me; I will neither be faced nor braved.

A Shrew, sig. E2v (SOP p. 198: SL p. 526):

Sander. Doost thou heare Tailor, thou hast braued  
Many men: braue not me  
Thou'st faste many men.

Tailor. Wel sir.

Sander. Face not me, ile neither be faste nor braued  
At thy hands I can tel thee.

"In this passage there is a play upon the terms 'fac'd' and 'brav'd'. In the tailor's sense, 'things' may be 'fac'd' and 'men' may be 'brav'd'; and, by means of this play, the tailor is entrapped into an answer. The imitator, having probably seen the play represented, has carried away the words, but by transposing them, and with the change of one expression -- 'men' for 'things' -- has lost the spirit: there is a pun no longer. He might have played upon 'brav'd', but there he does not wait for the tailor's answer; and 'fac'd', as he has it, can be understood but in one sense, and the tailor's admission becomes meaningless" (Hickson). See also Alexander, T.L.S. 1926, p. 614, and the New Cambridge Shakespeare: The Shrew p. 167-8.

2. The Shrew, IV iii 133-5:

Grumio. Master, if ever I said loose-bodied gown, sew me in the skirts of it, and beat me to death with a bottom of brown thread:...

A Shrew, sig. E2v (SL p. 526):

Sander. Maister if euer I said loose bodies gowne,  
Sew me in a seame, and beate me to death  
With a bottome of browne thred.

Here Hickson emphasises the Shakespearian spirit of the passage; but he also maintains that "the expression 'sew me in the skirts of it' has meaning, whereas the variation has none". It is true that the sequence "gown -- skirts of it" is much more piquant than "gowne -- seame".



3. The Shrew, IV iii 69-72:

Katharina. I'll have no bigger, this doth fit the time,  
 And gentlewomen wear such caps as these.  
 Petruchio. When you are gentle, you shall have one too,  
 And not till then.

Cf. A Shrew, sig. D4v (SOP p.194: SL p.523):

(Kate) For I wil home againe vnto my fathers house.

Ferando. I; when you'r meeke and gentel but not  
 Before.....

"Katherine's use of the term 'gentlewomen' (in The Shrew) suggests here Petruchio's 'gentle'. In the other play the reply is evidently imitated, but with the absence of the suggestive cue" (Hickson). See also New Cambridge The Shrew, p.167.

4. The Shrew, IV iii 167-72:

Petruchio. Well, come my Kate, we will unto your father's,  
 Even in these honest mean habiliments:  
 Our purses shall be proud, our garments poor:  
 For 'tis the mind that makes the body rich,  
 And as the sun breaks through the darkest clouds,  
 So honour peereth in the meanest habit.

A Shrew, sig. E2v-E3 (SOP p.198: SL p.527):

Come Kate we now will go see thy fathers house  
 Euen in these honest meane abilliments,  
 Our purses shall be rich, our garments plaine,  
 To shrowd our bodies from the winter rage  
 And thats inough, what should we care for more.

In The Shrew Petruchio urges "the vanity of outward appearance, in reference to the 'ruffs, and cuffs, and farthingales and things' which he had promised her, and with which the phrase 'honest mean habiliments' is used in contrast. The sufficiency to the mind of these,

For 'tis the mind that makes the body rich,

is the very pith and purpose of the speech. Commencing in nearly the same words, the imitator entirely mistakes this, in stating the object of clothing to be to 'shrowd us from the winter's rage'; which is, nevertheless, true enough, though completely beside the purpose" (Hickson). "It is clear as Hickson notes that the reporter has Shakespeare's lines in mind, though he cheapens the whole and misses the point" (New Camb. The Shrew, p.169).

5. The Shrew, II 1 172-3:

Say that she frown, I'll say she looks as clear  
As morning roses newly washed with dew.

"Here is perfect consistency: the clearness of the 'morning roses', arising from their being 'wash'd with dew'; at all events, the quality being heightened by the circumstance. In a passage of the so-called 'older' play, the duke is addressed by Kate as 'fair, lovely lady', &c.

"'As glorious as the morning wash'd with dew' (sig. Fl: SOP p.203: SL p.531). As the morning does not derive its glory from the circumstance of its being 'wash'd with dew', and as it is not a peculiarly apposite comparison, I conclude that here, too, as in other instances, the sound alone has caught the ear of the imitator." (Hickson) See also New Camb. The Shrew, p.149: "Roses 'washed with dew' are intelligible, but what is a morning in this kind?"

6. The Shrew, V ii 176-9:

The end of Katherine's last speech runs:-

Then vail your stomachs, for it is no boot,  
And place your hands below your husband's foot:  
In token of which duty, if he please,  
My hand is ready, may it do him ease.

Cf. A Shrew, sig. Glv (SOP p.213: SL p.540):

...Laying our handes vnder their feete to tread,  
If that by that we might procure there ease,  
And for a president Ile first begin,  
And lay my hand vnder my husbands feete...

Hickson explains the meaning of the third line of the extract from The Shrew as "as which token of duty" ('In token of which duty'), i.e. the placing of the wife's hand under her husband's foot is a token of her duty to him. "It is the performance of this 'token of duty' which Katharina hopes may 'do him ease'."

Hickson proceeds:

The imitator, as usual, has caught something of the words of the original, which he has laboured to reproduce at a most unusual sacrifice of grammar and sense; the....passage (in A Shrew) appearing to represent that the wives, by laying their hands under their husbands' feet -- no reference being made to the act as a token of duty -- in some unexplained manner, 'might procure them ease'.

See also the New Cambridge ed. of The Shrew, p. 179.

7. The Shrew, V ii 184-5:

Petruchio. Come Kate, we'll to bed.  
We three are married, but you two are sped.

A Shrew, sig. G2 (SOP p.214: SL p.541):

Tis Kate and I am wed, and you are sped.  
And so farewell for we will to our beds.

"Is it not evident that Shakespeare chose the word 'sped' as a

rhyme to 'bed', and that the imitator, in endeavouring to re-collect the jingle, has not only spoiled the rhyme, but missed the fact that all three were married, notwithstanding that two were sped?" (Hickson). See also New Camb. The Shrew, p.179. 'Sped' means 'done for'. The reference is to the wager made by Petruchio, Lucentio, and Hortensio at V ii 65-74: he whose wife shall come most promptly on being summoned by her husband will win a hundred crowns. Petruchio wins: "we three are married" he says -- i.e. Lucentio, Hortensio, and himself -- but "you two are sped", i.e. Lucentio and Hortensio have lost the wager (cf. the next line, addressed to Lucentio: "'Twas I won the wager, though you hit the white", 'white' being a pun as Johnson noted). So in writing "'Tis Kate and I am wed" the author of A Shrew has missed the point at the outset.

Not all of these are equally convincing. But Nos. 1 and 3 at least point undoubtedly to Hickson's conclusion. So we have seven parallel passages in which it seems likely that The Shrew ante-dates A Shrew: in two of these cases it is certain that this is so: we are therefore entitled to put that construction on the others.<sup>1</sup>

- 
1. Cf. B. A. P. Van Dam, article on The Taming of a Shrew in English Studies (Amsterdam), Vol. X (1928) p.99:

When there are several parallels in two plays, and when it is doubtful which has the original version, then, as soon as the priority of one passage can be proved, this proof decides the rest.

I accept Hickson's demonstration in Nos. 1 and 3 as proof: the evidence for his conclusion is there remarkably clear.

R. Warwick Bond (Arden ed. The Shrew, p. lx) dismisses the Hickson parallels in a sentence. "Comparing in each (i.e. A Shrew and The Shrew) the seven parallels.....I cannot see that they yield any argument for the precedence of either form." Chambers (William Shakespeare, Vol. I, p.327-8) is fuller: "It is true that some of these phrases have more point in The Shrew than in A Shrew. But this might be the case on either hypothesis, and the A Shrew versions are not unintelligible as they stand." Granting that these criticisms might be applied to one or two of Hickson's parallels, I am certain that Nos. 1 and 3 clinch the matter. It seems clear to me beyond any doubt that in these cases A Shrew depends on The Shrew: and these decide the rest. No more can be said: Bond and Chambers are simply ignoring the obvious.

Finally, it is important to notice that Hickson's parallels are confined to episodes in the main 'taming' plot; none of them occur in the sub-plot. And no less than four of them (Nos. 1-4) appear in (No. 4 just after) the scene in A Shrew with the tailor and the haberdasher.



A FERANDO SOLILOQUY: CORROBORATION OF HICKSON?

The soliloquy in A Shrew which corresponds to that at IV i 178-201 of The Shrew runs as follows:

<u>Ferando</u> . This humor must I holde me to awhile,	1
To bridle and holde backe my headstrong wife,	
With curbes of hunger: ease: and want of sleepe,	
Nor slepe nor meate shall she inioie to night,	
Ile mew her vp as men do mew their hawkes,	5
And make her gentlie come vnto the lure,	
Were she as stuborne or as full of strength	
As were the Thracian horse Alcides tamde,	
That King Egeus fed with flesh of men,	
Yet would I pull her downe and make her come	10
As hungry hawkes do flie vnto their lure.	

Line 5 is almost exactly the same as a line in Wily Beguiled,<sup>1</sup> lines 7-9 are filched from 2 Tamburlaine IV iii l2 ff., lines 5-6 and 10-11 repeat each other in a very clumsy fashion, and the speech contains a horribly mixed metaphor: so its writer can hardly be credited with much originality or poetic power. The sequence of lines 7-11 is particularly bad: even if Katharina were as stubborn as Egeus' horses, yet Ferando would entice her like a hawk to the lure.

- 
1. The line in Wily Beguiled runs "He mews her up as men do mew their hawks": see Dugdale Sykes, Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama, p.70. Sykes holds that Wily Beguiled and the taming scenes of A Shrew are both the work of Samuel Rowley: he would therefore maintain that Rowley repeats himself. A full treatment of his argument will be found in a separate section. See also Van Dam, English Studies, Vol. X, p.100, where it is suggested that, as Wily Beguiled borrows freely from Kyd, a line from A Shrew may also be borrowed. Thus the possibility that the writer of A Shrew here plagiarises from Wily Beguiled is only one of several. But the fact that line 5 above is followed almost immediately by a theft from 2 Tamburlaine must at least raise suspicion.

The metaphor in the corresponding soliloquy in The Shrew -- that of falconry -- is consistently developed. There are one or two verbal connections between the two versions. With lines 5-6 and 10-11 above compare the following from The Shrew:

My falcon now is sharp and passing empty,  
And till she stoop, she must not be full-gorged,  
For then she never looks upon her lure.  
Another way I have to man my haggard,  
To make her come and know her keeper's call.....

'Hungry' (A Shrew, line 11) is equivalent to the 'sharp and passing empty' of The Shrew, and the idea in A Shrew's 'Yet would I pull her downe' is the same as that of the falcon 'stooping' in The Shrew. There is a further parallelism, though not verbal, between A Shrew's line "Ile mew her vp as men do mew their hawkes" and The Shrew's "to watch her, as we watch these kites" (IV i 185).

But most important as regards a comparison of the two versions are IV i 198-9: compare these with the first three lines of the speech in A Shrew. Four of the key words in both are the same, arranged differently:

The Shrew: This is the way to kill a wife with kindness;  
And thus I'll curb her mad and headstrong humour.

A Shrew: This humor must I holde me to awhile,  
To bridle and holde back my headstrong wife,  
With curbes of hunger: ease: and want of sleepe,....

This makes it clear that there is a decided connection between the two soliloquies: can we say which was written first? I believe that the condition of the A Shrew version can only be explained on the assumption that its writer was trying to reconstruct Shakespeare's version: he remembered that that

version contained a metaphor from hawking, and he even remembered one or two phrases used in its development. But the two lines of which he remembered most were IV i 198-9; he recollected four of the principal words in these lines, and one of these words was curb. Now Shakespeare uses this word in a purely general sense: it does not conflict with his falconry metaphor. But, according to my view, the writer of A Shrew caught up not only the word but also the image which ultimately underlies it: he uses the word curb itself, but as a noun: and, the word having suggested to his mind the concrete image of a horse, the verb becomes specifically 'to bridle': thus he is all ready to imagine Katharina as a horse which must be broken in.

But why should he import the passage from Marlowe about the "Thracian horse Alcides tamde"? I suggest that this is a case precisely similar to one in the 1st Quarto of Hamlet. At I iii 126-31 in the 'good' texts Polonius warns his daughter against Hamlet:

in few Ophelia,  
Do not believe his vows, for they are brokers  
Not of that dye which their investments show,  
But mere implorators of unholy suits,  
Breathing like sanctified and pious bonds  
The better to beguile.

Hamlet's 'vows' are also mentioned earlier at lines 114 and 117. In Q1 Corambis says to Ofelia:

Come in Ofelia, such men often proue,  
"Great in their wordes, but little in their loue".  
scene iii, end.

Within the dozen lines preceding this in Q1 Hamlet's 'vowes' are also mentioned twice. Now the couplet quoted from Q1 is lifted

from Twelfth Night, where the passage runs (II iv 119-21):

We men may say more, swear more, but indeed  
Our shows are more than will, for still we prove  
Much in our vows, but little in our love.

Crompton Rhodes (Shakespeare's First Folio, p.80) says that clearly the mention of "vows" in the Hamlet dialogue has awakened the pirate's memory of these words spoken by Viola to the Duke in Twelfth Night. In other words, the verbal link between the Hamlet and Twelfth Night passages is the word "vows" which occurs in both: and this link causes the transference to Hamlet Q1 of the words from Twelfth Night. But it is important to note that in the transference the word "vows" in the Twelfth Night passage has been changed to "words": that is to say, in the transferred passage the verbal link itself has disappeared.

Now take Ferando's soliloquy in A Shrew. We have already seen how four words in two lines of The Shrew are found also (differently arranged) within three lines of A Shrew. We have suggested that one of these words in The Shrew ('curb') produced in the mind of the writer of A Shrew the idea of horse-taming. Another of the words is headstrong. Now 'headstrong' is the epithet applied by Marlowe to the 'jades of Thrace':

The headstrong jades of Thrace Alcides tamed  
That King Egeus fed with human flesh,  
And made so wanton that they knew their strengths  
Were not subdued with valour more divine,  
Than you by this unconquered arm of mine.

2 Tamburlaine, IV iii 12 ff.

I suggest, with some confidence, that, just as the writer of A Shrew remembered Shakespeare's curb and was led from it to

the verb bridle and the idea of horse-taming, so he remembered Shakespeare's headstrong (in the same line of The Shrew as curb) which acted as a verbal link between the passage in The Shrew and this particular passage about horse-taming in Marlowe: and, just as in Crompton Rhodes' example from Q1 Hamlet, the verbal link has itself disappeared from the transferred passage.

In this difficult matter there is, of course, no question of proof: but I suggest that the condition of the soliloquy in A Shrew makes it very probable that the author of that text, whoever he was, was recollecting two lines from Shakespeare's The Shrew (IV i 198-9). I advance this -- very tentatively -- as another case where priority is indicated for The Shrew; and again it is the main 'taming' plot and not the sub-plot which is involved.



THE FIRST INTERVIEW BETWEEN FERANDO AND KATE.

The text of the passage in which Ferando woos Kate in A Shrew<sup>1</sup> does not run parallel to the corresponding passage in The Shrew (II i 182-317). But there are some verbal connections between the two versions, and, at certain points, between that of A Shrew and other scenes in The Shrew. In the A Shrew version of this preliminary skirmish between Ferando-Petruchio and Kate the wit is crude, dull, and flat; in The Shrew the exchanges flash swiftly from the one speaker to the other in a brilliant display of verbal fireworks.

It may be argued that here A Shrew reproduces a version of the episode anterior to that of The Shrew, a Shakespearian revision having intervened. But it is much more probable that the A Shrew version of the episode represents an attempt at memorial reconstruction of that of The Shrew, made by someone whose memory was unable to cope with the speed and brilliance of his original. This person remembered fragments of various passages in The Shrew, and incorporated these into a version in which he had to rely mainly on invention to supplement a very defective memory of a decidedly difficult passage.

This latter theory receives support from the fact that two of the lines in the A Shrew passage seem to combine reminiscences

---

1. Hazlitt, Shakespeare's Library, Pt. II, vol. 2. p.502, line 9; p. 503, line 19.

of several widely separated passages in The Shrew. The two lines are these:

Fer. My mind sweet Kate doth say I am the man  
Must wed, and bed, and marrie bonnie Kate.

(p. 502, lines 13-14)

With this compare in the first place Gremio's words in The Shrew  
I i 141 ff.:

.... would I had given him the best horse in Padua to  
begin his wooing that would thoroughly woo her, wed  
her and bed her and rid the house of her.

Secondly, Petruchio uses the words "bonny Kate" twice -- at II i 186 and III ii 225. But most interesting is the construction "I am the man must wed etc". In the corresponding scene in The Shrew Petruchio says "Thou must be married to no man but me./ For I am he am born to tame you, Kate,..." (II i 268-9). The writer of our two lines in A Shrew seems to have confused this with I ii 261-2, where Tranio says to Petruchio "If it be so, sir, that you are the man / Must stead us all and me among the rest; ....".<sup>1</sup> It seems very much more probable that a memorial reconstructor combined various fragments which he remembered from The Shrew than that Shakespeare separated out words and phrases from two closely-knit lines in a source-play and re-distributed them at wide intervals in his revised version.

I give below all the other phraseological links which I have been able to find between this episode in A Shrew and the

---

1. Cf. also A Shrew p. 503, line 10 -- "did I not tell thee I should be the man,".

## Shakespearian play.

A Shrew, Shak. Lib. II, 2,  
p. 502.

The Shrew.

- line  
9 Twentie good morrowes to my  
louely Kate
- 15 asse
- 18 I wil set...in your face
- 23 the woodcock wants his taile.
- 25 what saies my daughter?
- 26 Shees willing
- 29 let me giue thy hand/To  
him...  
Also p. 503 line 6 -- Giue  
me thy hand  
(both spoken by Alfonso)
- 30 To him that I haue chosen  
for thy loue.  
(spoken by Alfonso)
- p. 503  
9 And Sunday next shall be  
your wedding day.  
(spoken by Alfonso)  
Note the discrepancy between  
this and p.502 line 31, where  
the wedding is to be "tomorrow".
- II i 182 Good morrow, Kate
- II i 199 (But the significance of  
the word here is not reproduced  
in A Shrew).
- I ii 112 he will throw a figure  
in her face...
- The writer may have remembered  
"tail" from II i 214, but not  
its context; he may also have  
remembered I ii 158 -- "O this  
woodcock...", again without its  
context. These reminiscences  
affect the phrasing of a wit-  
ticism of his own.
- This corresponds to II i 274 --  
"how speed you with my daughter",  
a recollection of which may be  
contaminated by mixture with II  
1 293 -- "she says she'll see  
the hanged first".
- cf. IV iv 34-5, where the bogus  
father says to Baptista "We shall  
you find ready and willing/...to  
have her so bestowed".
- II i 311, where Baptista says  
"give me your hands", and  
ibid 307, where Petruchio says  
"Give me thy hand, Kate".
- II i 295, where Petruchio says "I  
choose her for myself".
- II i 291 ...upon Sunday is the  
wedding-day (spoken by Petruchio).

A Shrew

12 Father (vocative: Ferando  
to Alfonso)

13 Provide your selues against  
our marriage daie

17-8 come Kate why doost thou  
looke/So sad,  
(spoken by Alfonso).

18 be merrie wench  
(spoken by Alfonso).

The Shrew

II i 283, 309, 314.

II i 307-9 I will unto Venice,  
To buy apparel 'gainst the wed-  
ding day./Provide the feast,  
father, and bid the guests,....

Reminiscences of two passages seem  
to be combined: (1) II i 226  
"Nay, come, Kate, come; you must  
not look so sour", (spoken by  
Petruchio), and (2) II i 142  
"How now, my friend, why dost  
thou look so pale?" (spoken by  
Baptista to Hortensio).

IV i 139 "Be merry, Kate" (spoken  
by Petruchio).  
"Wench" occurs passim.

I find it difficult to believe that in revising A Shrew Shakespeare separated words and phrases found close together in that play and scattered them about over a wide area in his revised version. This is not his method in revising The Troublesome Raigne or the old Leir play. On the other hand, the above list of parallels seems to me to suggest a memorial reconstructor remembering isolated fragments of The Shrew, combining these, and introducing them into a version largely his own; he was trying to botch up some sort of equivalent of the wooing scene in The Shrew, a scene of whose text he knew but little.

'SUPPOSES', 'THE SHREW', and 'A SHREW'.

Hickson argued from the parallel passages he cited that A Shrew post-dates The Shrew; but he held that the author of A Shrew, the 'imitator' of The Shrew, was Marlowe; this has already been criticised. In an important article on The Taming of A Shrew in the Times Literary Supplement, 1926 vol., p.614 (Sept. 16), Peter Alexander also argued for the priority of The Shrew, and the derivation of A Shrew from it, mentioning with approval the seven parallels just cited and Hickson's deduction therefrom: see also his Henry VI and Richard III pp. 69-70, where he expresses the view that Hickson "showed conclusively, if ever textual evidence was conclusive, that the pirate had given himself away by reproducing in some instances everything of Shakespeare's quip except the point". Alexander developed the hypothesis that the 1594 edition is a 'bad quarto'<sup>1</sup> -- an attempt at reconstructing as much of The Shrew as its compiler(s) could remember.

Alexander compares the two Shrew texts with the plot of Ariosto's I Suppositi, which was translated into English by Gascoigne as Supposes in 1566: both Shrew plays are indebted to I Suppositi, or more probably to Supposes, for certain elements in the sub-plot. Alexander shows that in some respects The Shrew keeps closer to Supposes than A Shrew does, and finds

---

1. Continuing the work of J. S. Smart. See Shakespeare, Truth and Tradition, pp. 201-5.



ground here too for claiming priority for The Shrew. In his triple comparison and his conclusion from it he was anticipated by Wilhelm Creizenach, of whom however he makes no mention: see Creizenach, Geschichte des neueren Dramas, Band IV (1909), pp. 686, 693-8. I give the points raised by Alexander, along with references to Creizenach where necessary.

1. The Locality: In Supposes the action takes place in Ferrara, in The Shrew in Padua (because that was for Shakespeare's audience the typical University town of Italy), and in A Shrew in Athens. If Shakespeare founded The Shrew on A Shrew, says Alexander, he must have changed the locality back to Italy at the suggestion of Supposes. The author of A Shrew was strongly influenced by Marlowe -- that is freely granted; he chose as his hero's home Sestos, which he spells Cestus, probably, Alexander suggests, prompted to this choice by knowledge and admiration of Hero and Leander, A Shrew being therefore not earlier than Marlowe's last and unfinished poem. Then he chose Athens as the scene of the action, that being a great University town near Sestos. See also Creizenach, op. cit. p. 694, where the fact that the scene is an Italian university town in Ariosto and Shakespeare and Athens in A Shrew is held to be one of the indications that The Shrew occupies a position intermediate between Ariosto and Shakespeare. This point is not perhaps of much importance: certainly the other points are much more important as they involve dramatic incompetence in A Shrew.

2. The Disguised Hero: In Supposes and The Shrew the hero, in order to have access to the girl, enters her father's house disguised as a servant. In A Shrew, however, there is no need for this menial disguise, since the girl is not denied the conversation of her suitors. In that play the hero, Aurelius (son of the Duke of Cestus), asks to be introduced to the girl's father as a rich merchant's son: but no reason is given for this. See Creizenach, op. cit. p. 695: "Es wird nicht etwa gesagt, dass er fürchtet, vom Vater der Geliebten zurückgewiesen zu werden, wenn er sich in seiner wahren Eigenschaft einführe.....".
3. The Masquerading Servant: In Supposes and The Shrew, just as the hero disguises himself as a servant, so his servant adopts the identity of the hero, and to further his master's interests becomes a suitor for the heroine's hand (presenting competition to an elderly suitor who might otherwise gain acceptance from the heroine's father before the disguised hero was ready). In A Shrew, also, the hero's servant (Valeria) is ordered to assume the identity of the Duke of Cestus' son (although Aurelius, disguised as a merchant's son retains his own name): but as the elderly suitor does not exist in that play, no purpose is served by this artifice: there is no rivalry for the hand of the disguised hero's lady.

Die Rolle des alten Freiers Gremio, die Shakespeare aus Ariostos Lustspiele übernahm, ist in dem anonymen Stück ausgefallen und der Diener hat gar keine Veranlassung in der Maske seines Herrn dazwischen zu treten, um den Nebenbuhler durch Anbieten einer höheren Geldsumme zum Rücktritt zu zwingen, was auch schon deshalb nicht nötig wäre, weil ja Aurelius selber für einen reichen Kaufmannssohn gilt.

Creizenach, op. cit. p. 695.

Thus there is no reason for Aurelius disguising himself in A Shrew (point 2), and there is likewise no reason for his servant assuming his identity (point 3): as Creizenach says, "der ganze Rollentausch hat überhaupt keinen Zweck" (p. 695). Furthermore, as both Alexander and Creizenach proceed to point out, soon after it is arranged, pointlessly, that Valeria shall assume the rank of his master, Valeria is ordered to adopt quite another disguise: Aurelius says to him:

Valeria, as erste we did deuise,  
Take thou thy lute and go to Alfonso's house,...

(Alfonso is equivalent to the Baptista of The Shrew). But this was not devised before. And some time after Valeria has taken the part of the ill-starred music-tutor, he appears before Alfonso in the disguise first planned, as the Duke of Cestus' son. There seems no reason why he should do so, for the disguised hero himself introduces his supposed father: all that Valeria can say in his role of the Duke's son is this:

I did come to see  
When as these marriage rites should be performed,  
And if in these nuptialls you vouchsafe  
To honour thus the prince of Cestus frend,  
In celebration of his spousall rites  
He shall remaine a lasting friend to you,...

Creizenach is doubtless right in assuming that the only reason for bringing on the disguised Valeria here is that the author of A Shrew wanted the real Duke of Cestus, on his arrival, to find his son's servant masquerading as his master (as in Supposes and The Shrew): see Creizenach, op. cit. p. 695. Similarly, the reason for making Valeria disguise himself as a music-teacher

(contrary to the main dramatic design) was doubtless that the author wished to reproduce the comic business of the breaking of the lute over the luckless tutor's head but had not included a character corresponding to Shakespeare's Hortensio. The position is that the author of A Shrew has not provided for two comic episodes which he finds he wants to insert: so at the last minute in each case he does provide for them, the result being a substantial measure of clumsiness in the drama viewed as a whole. One of these comic episodes is in Supposes, but be it noted the other (that of the musician) is not: this is important.

4. The Supposed Father. In both Supposes and The Shrew it is the masquerading servant who asks this character to confirm the generous marriage settlement which he has, when disguised as the hero, promised to the girl's father (in furtherance of his master's suit). In A Shrew it is the hero himself (Aurelius) who introduces a stranger as his father.

5. I would add another point in which The Shrew is nearer Supposes than A Shrew is. The Shrew contains the names Petrucchio and Licio, not found in A Shrew: it would appear that these two Shakespearian names are ultimately derived from two in Supposes, where 'Petrucio' is one of the servants of the stranger who masquerades as the hero's father, and Lytio or Litio the servant of the real father: Petrucio appears but has nothing to say; Litio has a great deal to say, rather in the manner of Grumio.

6. It is convenient to refer here to another dramatic deficiency in A Shrew, although Supposes is not in this case involved. Creizenach (op. cit. pp. 695-6) points out that, in The Shrew, the scene where Petruchio and Katharina meet Vincentio and greet him as a young woman (IV v 27 ff.) has a distinct connection with the course of the action. For Petruchio tells Vincentio that his son Lucentio is about to be married, and then all proceed to Padua. In A Shrew, on the other hand, all that is involved in the meeting of Ferando and Kate with the Duke of Cestus is the jest itself. The Duke enters alone, tells us that he does not know the way to Athens, is addressed as a "faire louely maide" by Ferando and Kate, assumes that they are both mad, and, leaving them, hurries off on his way to Athens (although he still does not know the way). This point is also raised by B. A. P. Van Dam (The Taming of A Shrew, English Studies (Amsterdam) vol. X (1928) p. 100).

Creizenach and Alexander take these points to indicate for The Shrew a position intermediate between Ariosto and A Shrew. In the respects alluded to The Shrew follows Supposes more closely than does A Shrew. If we believe that Shakespeare founded The Shrew on A Shrew, we must imagine him using both A Shrew and Supposes -- both his source and a source of that source. It is far more natural to imagine that Shakespeare used only Supposes, and that some writer, trying to reproduce the plot of The Shrew, made alterations in it.

E. K. Chambers, however, would see nothing unlikely about



the procedure which Alexander and Creizenach reject. He believes that the sub-plot of The Shrew was the work of a collaborator of Shakespeare, and that this person, whoever he was, "made use of I Suppositi or its translation in Gascoigne's Supposes, as well as of A Shrew" (William Shakespeare, vol. 1, p. 328).<sup>1</sup> But Chambers ignores the vitally important point that some of the respects in which A Shrew is further from Supposes than The Shrew is involve extraordinary dramaturgic awkwardness in A Shrew. Now it would be possible to argue that this can be accounted for by the hypothesis that (at any rate as far as the sub-plots are concerned) the two Shrew plays were independently derived from Supposes and that Shakespeare retained certain features of his source which the author of A Shrew altered (somewhat injudiciously from the dramatic point of view). But -- and this is the important point -- one of A Shrew's dramaturgic ineptitudes arises from the desire to drag in a comic episode found in The Shrew but not in Supposes: as we have seen, the reason for disguising the servant Valeria as a music-teacher almost immediately after it has been arranged that he shall be disguised as the Duke's son is to bring in Katharina's music-

- 
1. See also Warwick Bond, Arden ed. The Shrew, p. lx:  
 "It is quite true that the latter (i.e. The Shrew) is nearer to Ariosto than A Shrew; but neither is this argument for its priority, for Shakespeare may, even after A Shrew, have independently reverted to the Italian play, and could do so easily through Gascoigne's pretty close translation of it in his Supposes."

lesson, with its farcical conclusion<sup>1</sup> -- an episode which has no foundation in Ariosto. Does not this strongly suggest that The Shrew was in existence when A Shrew was composed? But there is another possibility.

- 
1. It should, however, be remembered that in A Shrew there is a motive for Valeria giving Kate the music-lesson: it is "an over-subtle plan to keep the shrew away from her sisters...and thus to give these ladies an opportunity to receive their lovers" (A. H. Tolman, P.M.L.A., Vol.V, p.224). Even so, the artifice of making Valeria take two disguised parts is extremely clumsy; and when we find that Aurelius tells him to dress up as a music-tutor "as erste we did devise" when quite another disguise was devised before, our suspicions remain alive.

A LOST "SHREW" PLAY?

In the prefatory note to an article on A Midsummer Night's Dream (Shakespeare Jahrbuch, vol. XIII (1878) pp. 92-110) Bernhard ten Brink states his view of the relationship between the two Shrew texts, but presents no arguments in its favour. As far as I can discover, he never published the reasons for his theory, which is as follows: A Shrew and The Shrew are independently derived from a common source; this source was an early Shakespearian play, now lost. The early play differed from The Shrew especially in the fact that the element derived from Supposes was wanting. I quote ten Brink's own words (op. cit. p. 94):

Die Art, wie ich Taming of the Shrew beiläufig erwähne, macht eine Verständigung in Betreff der Taming of a Shrew notwendig. Letzterers Stück halte ich weder für ein Jugendwerk Shakespeares noch für das Original, welches dieser benutzt hat, noch endlich für eine Bearbeitung der Shakespeare'schen Komödie, die uns in der Folio überliefert ist. Meiner Ansicht nach, beruhen Taming of a Shrew und das beinahe gleichnamige Stück der Folio auf einer gemeinsamen Quelle; diese Quelle aber war eine Jugendarbeit Shakespeares, die sich von der spätern Fassung namentlich auch dadurch unterschied, dass das<sup>aus</sup> den Supposes entlehnte Motiv ihrer einfachen Intrigue noch abging. Für eine Begründung dieser Hypothese ist hier keine Raum.

As recently as 1935 ten Brink's theory has been revived. Hardin Craig (Shakespeare, pp. 296-7) believes that A Shrew is not a "source" of The Shrew: of the former text he says that it is either as ten Brink thought, a play derived from a common original with Shakespeare's play, or, according to a recent idea,<sup>1</sup> a version of Shakespeare's play taken down

---

1. He refers (footnote p. 296) to Alexander's article, T.L.S. 1926, p.614.

from oral delivery and carefully revamped. The original shrew play is lost.

(op. cit. p. 296)

As regards the relationship of The Shrew and Supposes, Craig asserts (p. 297) that "Shakespeare has gone directly to Gascoigne and followed his source very closely". He proceeds:

Of this much we can be sure: The Taming of the Shrew is the revision of an older play, which is not The Taming of a Shrew. An examination of Shakespeare's text indicates that he was revising an old play now lost, some parts of which he left standing. His revision is thorough-going and drastic in the major plot of Katharina and Petruchio, and he has worked over the minor plot with great care, introducing new elements into the Gremio-Hortensio-Lucentio-Tranio plot.<sup>1</sup>

(op. cit. p. 297)

Craig thinks it likely that Shakespeare worked on the play about 1595: so, as the Quarto (A Shrew) was issued in 1594, he cannot maintain that that text represents an attempt at reconstructing The Shrew in the form in which we have it in the Folio: we would expect him, therefore, to vote for the ten Brink theory rather than that of Alexander. But again there is no discussion.

In his monograph on Shakespeare's Part in the "Taming of the Shrew" (P.M.L.A., vol. V (1890) pp. 201-78) Albert H. Tolman views ten Brink's hypothesis very favourably. Tolman himself thinks that "The Taming of a Shrew and The Supposes are direct sources of The Taming of the Shrew and the most important ones -- unless The Taming of a Shrew and The Taming of the Shrew

---

1. He refers (footnote 1, p.297) to Miss F. H. Ashton, Philological Quarterly, Vol. VI, pp. 151-60.

have a common source in a work of Shakespeare's youth, an earlier version of The Taming of the Shrew" (op. cit. p. 203). On p.204 he states that some difficulties have never been adequately explained except by ten Brink's view: this is true. This essay is the only place, as far as I know, where anything approaching a discussion of this important hypothesis can be found. On pp. 225-6 certain objections to it are mentioned: one or two passages in The Shrew seem to have been suggested by A Shrew, and fit A Shrew better than The Shrew. If this is indeed so, we have grounds for supposing that their presence in The Shrew is due to careless revision of A Shrew: but Tolman himself declares that the passages in The Shrew do not seem to him to prove that their writer necessarily had A Shrew in mind: but he leaves the possibility open.

1. The Shrew I ii 196.

In The Shrew Petruchio has travelled to Padua from his native Verona to seek his fortune and "haply to wive and thrive as best I may": Hortensio suggests to him that he attempt to woo Katharina, and Petruchio joyfully agrees: Hortensio tells Gremio of Petruchio's intention, and we have this dialogue:

Gremio But will you woo this wild-cat?

Petruchio Will I live?

Gremio Will he woo her? ay, or I'll hang her.

Petruchio Why came I hither but to that intent?

Now of course strictly speaking Petruchio did not come to Padua to woo Katharina: the plan was suggested to him after his arrival. Tolman suggests that possibly the writer had in mind



the situation in A Shrew: in that play, Ferando actually resides in Athens; he woos Kate of his own accord, her father having promised him six thousand crowns if he succeeds; when we first see him he is on his way to try his luck with her; Polidor says to Ferando's servant

I would thy maister once were in the vaine  
To trie himselfe how he could woe a wench.

And Ferando answers:

Faith I am euen now a going.

Ferando might in this situation have exclaimed "Why came I hither but to that intent?"

But the objection to the line in its context in The Shrew springs from a far too literal interpretation. Petruchio has fastened avidly on Hortensio's suggestion: he is an impulsive character -- he is all ready to begin his crazy suit; he is impatient with these Hortensios and Gremios with their warnings and wet-blanketings; at last, having been asked repeatedly if he really means to go through with it, he bursts out impatiently

Why came I hither but to that intent?  
Think you a little din can daunt mine ears?  
Have I not in my time heard lions roar? etc.

He came to Padua to get a wife, and a rich one; here he has a splendid opportunity of realising his purpose, with the prospect of a little sport thrown in; this is what he came for, and he is dying to get on with it. There is no incongruity here in The Shrew.

in The Shrew Hortensio enters "with his head broke" and tells his story. Petruchio exclaims (line 161) "I love her ten times more than e'er I did". Tolman comments on this: "It cannot belong to Petruchio except in joke; he has never seen Katherine, and has heard only evil of her". In A Shrew Ferando has seen and crossed swords with Kate before the music-lesson. But this is absurd: Tolman seems quite blind to the most obvious traits in Petruchio's character. From the very moment when the plan is broached Petruchio looks forward with relish to the prospect of taming this shrew: this latest example of her ways only increases the joy of the prospect. A young lady who does this sort of thing is the young lady for him; he likes a woman of spirit, and he is going to enjoy subjecting her to his taming hand:

Now, by the world, it is a lusty wench.  
I love her ten times more than e'er I did,  
O, how I long to have some chat with her!

When Hortensio and Gremio told him what sort of lady Katharina was Petruchio had at once determined that this was the woman for him; now that he has seen a specimen of her handiwork that determination is strengthened ten-fold.

3. In the Induction of The Shrew Christopher Sly is ejected from the inn by the hostess; in A Shrew he is the victim of a tapster. At line 13 in The Shrew Sly says "I'll not budge an inch, boy": Tolman quotes Albert R. Frey ('Bankside' Shakespeare, vol. II, intro. p.10):

This, as it now stands, does not make very good sense. Sly is addressing the Hostess, but our author probably overlooked the fact that he had changed the sex of the inn-keeper, and, having his (?) older version before him, he unconsciously wrote a line which, although it would be appropriate enough for The Taming of A Shrew, is out of place in its successor.

Tolman himself says that "Sly's drunkenness gives to the word 'boy' in the above passage a certain blundering fitness; but Mr Frey's explanation is, perhaps, the natural one". But see the note on the passage in the New Cambridge edition of The Shrew (p. 129): "boy an insult, not a mere piece of drunken oblivion", and the glossary (p. 188):

Boy, a term of abuse or contempt, meaning 'coward, traitor, wretch' (cf. Coriolanus, V vi 101-17).

In this sense the word could be applied to either sex.

These are the only arguments which Tolman can find in favour of A Shrew as a source of The Shrew against ten Brink's theory of the derivation of the two plays from a common source-play now lost. I think we may confidently claim that they fall to the ground. What now of the arguments in favour of ten Brink's theory, or a modification of it?

AN OBJECTION TO THE "BAD QUARTO" THEORY.

Chambers and Warwick Bond have one very powerful argument against the hypothesis of Alexander and Dover Wilson that A Shrew represents an attempt at a memorial reconstruction of The Shrew. "The relationship of A Shrew to The Shrew," says Chambers, "does not bear any analogy to that of other 'bad Quartos' to the legitimate texts from which they are memorized. The nomenclature, which at least a memorizer can recall, is entirely different. The verbal parallels are limited to stray phrases, most frequent in the main plot" (William Shakespeare, vol. 1, p. 327). Bond also accuses the upholders of the "bad Quarto" theory of ignoring "the almost complete change in the dialogue throughout": in the sub-plot there are "considerable changes of scene, names, management, and diction" (Arden ed. The Shrew, intro., note p. lx). He points out that The 1st Part of the Contention and the True Tragedy -- texts placed by Alexander in the same category as A Shrew -- reproduce with fair accuracy about one half and two thirds respectively of the corresponding Folio versions: A Shrew comes nowhere near this: in the sub-plot I can find only one verbal parallel with The Shrew.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. See A Shrew, Shak. Lib., Pt. II, vol. ii, p. 521: Aurelius and his servant Valeria are talking of Polidor's approaching marriage:

Val. But tell me my Lord, is Ferando married then?

Aur. He is: and Polidor shortly shall be wed,  
And he meanes to tame his wife ere long.

Val. He saies so.

Aur./

I regard Hickson's evidence for the priority of The Shrew as very strong indeed; but, as has been pointed out, it is confined to the 'taming' plot. As regards that portion of the play, I am convinced that A Shrew does in fact represent an attempt at reconstructing the corresponding portion of The Shrew, or of a version very close to The Shrew. The tables of parallel words and phrases set out above show that in the Petruchio (Farando)-Katharina plot there is a comparatively large number of verbal parallels; and in that part of the action the two texts have exactly the same incidents and situations. In fact, the relationship between the two texts in the 'taming' plot is analogous to that of other 'bad Quartos' to the authentic texts of which they are memorial reconstructions. This is also the opinion of M. R. Ridley (New Temple ed. The Shrew, intro. p. viii): "Any reader, I think, who will take the trouble to compare the relevant passages will feel that the passages in A Shrew read much more like abbreviated garblings of the passages in The Shrew than the latter read like improved expansions of the passages in A Shrew -- will feel, indeed, that so far as these passages are concerned the relation is singularly like that between the first and second Quartos of Hamlet." These

Aur. Faith he's gone vnto the taming schoole.

Val. The taming schoole; why is there such a place?

Aur. I: and Ferando is the Maister of the schoole.

Cf. The Shrew, IV ii 50-6. The two versions are very close indeed, which makes the absence of any other distinct verbal contact in the two sub-plots all the more strange.



passages in A Shrew are all to be found in the main plot (or in the Induction). Then Ridley continues: "On the other hand the relation between these two plays (i.e. A Shrew and The Shrew) as a whole is not a parallel to that between the two Hamlet Quartos, since great portions of A Shrew show only the vaguest correspondence to The Shrew and the Marlowesque portions no correspondence at all." The memorial reconstructor did not badly with the 'taming' scenes: he remembered all the incidents and quite a lot of the dialogue. Is it not then extraordinary that he should display so much ignorance of the sub-plot as to reproduce none of the dialogue and to endow Alfonso (Baptista) with three daughters instead of two? The relationship between the two Shrew texts in the sub-plot cannot be the same as the relationship between them in the main 'taming' plot.

WHAT IS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TWO SUB-PLOTS?

The theme of the taming of the shrewish wife is a common one in folk-lore, both western and oriental, and is met with in a multiplicity of forms. The version closest to the Shakespearian story occurs in Svend Grundtvig's collection of Danish folktales; a translation into German by Reinhold Köhler is to be found in the Shakespeare Jahrbuch, vol. III, p.397, and a reprint of this translation in Karl Simrock's Die Quellen des Shakespeares in Novellen, Märchen, und Sagen (1870) vol. 1, pp.345-8.<sup>1</sup> In this version a man has three daughters, Karen, Maren and Mette; all are of a shrewish disposition but Mette is much the worst. Karen and Maren get married, but Mette has more difficulty. At length, however, a suitor arrives, from a distance. He contracts to meet Mette at the church at a certain hour, but arrives late, on an old gray horse, carrying a rifle, wearing a pair of woolen gloves, and followed by a large dog. No sooner is the marriage ceremony over than the bridegroom insists, despite the protests of the bride's parents, on setting out with his wife for his own house. They depart, riding on the one horse. On the way, the husband gives the wife two examples of what happens to dependents who refuse to obey him: he drops his glove, orders the dog three

---

1. A synopsis appears in Tolman's article, P.M.L.A. vol. V p. 235. See also a note in the Eversley Shakespeare (Herford) vol. II, p. 5.

times to pick it up, and, the dog refusing to do so, shoots him. They dismount and take a rest, after which the husband commands his horse three times to come to him: the horse will not obey, and is also shot. Then the husband takes a green twig, bends the ends together, and gives it to his wife, telling her to keep it till he asks for it again. They walk home. For years the wife is obedient. One day the husband resolves that they shall visit his wife's parents. They set out; and soon they see some storks. The husband says that they are ravens, the wife corrects him, and he takes his too independent wife home again. They set out a second time. They see some sheep and lambs: the husband says that they are wolves, is again corrected by his wife, and again insists on their returning home. They set out a third time. They see some hens, the husband calls them crows, this time the wife submits to his ruling, and they proceed on their journey now that she is tamed. When they arrive, they find Karen and Maren there with their husbands. The father promises a large reward to the husband who can prove that he has the most obedient wife. The husbands of Karen and Maren in turn summon their wives, who, with Mette, are talking to their mother. Both refuse to come. But Mette responds instantly and her husband wins the reward. Then he asks her for the twig, shows it to the other two husbands, and says "I bent this when it was green; you should have done the same".

Here, then, is a legend, based on the shrew-taming motif,

very close in some important respects to the Shakespearian story, and agreeing with A Shrew (against The Shrew) in giving the father three daughters. It is possible, therefore that behind A Shrew there lies a source which agreed with the Danish story in having three sisters, not two. I confess to finding this more likely than that a clumsy reporter was attempting to reconstruct the situation in The Shrew and simply forgot how many daughters Baptista had. And this view is strengthened by the fact that there are numerous verbal contacts between the two plays in the Petruchio-Katharina scenes, and even in the Induction, whereas in the sub-plot the two texts are phraseologically unrelated.

Now there is something decidedly odd about the part of Hortensio in The Shrew. He is one of the suitors for Bianca's hand, in rivalry with Lucentio and the elderly Gremio. Access to Bianca is forbidden until Katharina shall be married, so Hortensio disguises himself as a music-teacher in order to have opportunities for conversation with her in furtherance of his suit. But, as Dover Wilson points out, no sooner does he disguise himself as Licio than he seems to drop out of the running as a suitor (New Camb. The Shrew, p. 125). At the end of III i we are prepared for Hortensio's forswearing Bianca: and in IV ii we hear him do so: having overheard love-passages between Lucentio (disguised as Cambio) and Bianca, he vows "never to woo her more" (lines 28-9): and then, very abruptly, we hear of a new character:

305.

"For me" says Hortensio "that I may surely keep mine oath,  
I will be married to a wealthy widow,  
Ere three days pass, which hath as long loved me  
As I have loved this proud disdainful haggard."

It cannot, I think, be denied that the wealthy widow is introduced into the play with a sudden jerk: she has loved Hortensio as long as he has loved Bianca, yet we have not heard of her until this point. And we do not see her until the last scene in the play when she appears to make a third in the contest of wifely obedience.

It seems to me not unlikely that the Widow is suddenly dragged in by Shakespeare, more than half way through The Shrew, as a piece of mechanism to rescue the plot from an impasse. At the beginning of the play Bianca has three suitors, apart from the disguised Tranio: clearly it was Shakespeare's intention from the outset that the pantaloon Gremio should fill the role of the incongruous wooer who is very properly rejected; this is the role of Cleander in Supposes. But neither is Hortensio to marry Bianca; what is to happen to him? Until he mentions the wealthy widow in IV ii, with an abruptness which is suspicious in the extreme, it is difficult to see what can ultimately be done with him. Is it not probable that Shakespeare invented the Widow on the spur of the moment, in order to extricate himself from this difficulty?

Dover Wilson suspects that behind The Shrew as we have it in the Folio there lies an older play in which Hortensio's part was fuller and more consistent (see New Camb. The Shrew, pp. 124-5. I agree that conditions in the Folio version make this a



likely hypothesis. I suggest that the reason why Shakespeare had suddenly to invent a new character to get Hortensio out of an impossible situation was that he himself, in altering the older play, had got him into that situation. If, in giving Katharina two sisters, A Shrew preserves a feature of the old play which Shakespeare revised into The Shrew, we have a tidy explanation of the difficulties which the part of Hortensio arouses in the Folio play. Suppose that in the old play the prototypes of Lucentio and Hortensio are suitors for the hands of different ladies, the shrew's two sisters. Shakespeare sees that he can create a delightfully comic situation by making them rivals for the same lady's hand and by disguising both as tutors working in opposition to each other. So he reduces the shrew's two sisters to one. But half way through his new play he discovers, naturally enough, that he must find a wife for Hortensio; so he invents the wealthy widow on the spur of the moment and we become acquainted with her existence very suddenly at IV ii 37.<sup>1</sup>

I want to suggest, then, but only tentatively, that while in the Ferando(Petruchio)-Katharina scenes, and parts of the Induction, the relation of A Shrew to The Shrew is directly analogous to that of other memorially constructed 'bad' texts to

---

1. I think it highly improbable that the author(s) of A Shrew, capable of perpetrating the clumsy dramatic blunders which Creizenach and Alexander emphasize, can be presumed to have consciously changed the Shakespearian design in order to avoid having to bring in a "deus ex machina" in the last half of the play.

the corresponding authentic versions, it is possible that in the sub-plot A Shrew owes something to a lost Shrew play earlier than either of the extant texts, which Shakespeare revised into The Shrew. I leave this tentative suggestion standing for the present; I hope to have an opportunity at some other time to make a close study of The Shrew itself, for this is essential. Miss F. H. Ashton has convinced herself that there are distinct traces in the Folio text of a process of revision which entailed additions to the sub-plot (see Philological Quarterly, vol. VI (1927) pp. 151-60). If this could be upheld it might be possible to catch some glimpses of the earlier sub-plot and compare it with that of A Shrew.

THE VERBAL PARALLEL IN THE SUB-PLOT.

As has been noted, there is only one close verbal parallel between A Shrew and The Shrew in the sub-plot.

The Shrew, IV ii 53 ff.: speaking of Hortensio and the Widow Tranio says "Ay, and he'll tame her": then we have the following dialogue:-

Bianca. He says so, Tranio.  
Tranio. Faith, he is gone unto the taming school.  
Bianca. The taming school! what, is there such a place?  
Tranio. Ay, mistress, and Petruchio is the master...

A Shrew, Hazlitt, Shakespeare's Library Pt. II, vol. ii, p.521:

Aurelius. ..and Polidor shortly shall be wed,  
 And he means to tame his wife erelong.  
Valeria. He saies so.  
Aurelius. Faith he's gon vnto the taming schoole.  
Valeria. The taming schoole; why is there such a place?  
Aurelius. I: and Ferando is the Maister of the schoole.

There is a story on the shrew-taming theme in Straparola's Notte Piacevoli (1550: translated into French as Les Facetieuses Nuits, 1573) in which two friends Pisardo and Silverio, marry two sisters, Fiorella and Spinella. Pisardo tames his wife; and Silverio comes to discover his methods, in order that he may apply them to his wife; he asks to what school Pisardo had sent Fiorella. (See Tolman, P.M.L.A. vol. V, p.236.) I do not want to over-emphasise this point; but I suggest that not impossibly the parallel in the two Shrew plays need not indicate that either

was derived from the other. It is possible that to some forms of the folk-tale underlying the main plot of the two plays there was attached a joke about the school for taming shrewish wives: a trace of this is preserved by Straparola, and also, independently and in an original form, in the early Shrew play which ten Brink and Hardin Craig postulate as underlying both A Shrew and The Shrew.<sup>1</sup> On this view, the authors of both extant Shrew plays preserved the passage from the hypothetical source-play, with adjustments of nomenclature.

This is the merest conjecture: but it is certainly very peculiar that (a) the 'taming school' passage should be practically identical in both plays, while (b) there is not a single other definite verbal parallel in the sub-plots, and (c) there is independent evidence in Straparola of some sort of joke about a school for making wives submissive attached to a shrew-taming story.

---

1. No direct connection is postulated between Straparola's story and the hypothetical lost play underlying both A Shrew and The Shrew.

A SHREW: A COMPOSITE STRUCTURE?

I believe that the text of A Shrew is a crude patchwork; the 'taming' scenes and portions of the Induction are based on the corresponding parts of The Shrew as found in the Folio. The lovers' sub-plot stands in a less direct relationship to that of The Shrew, and may reproduce some features of that of a hypothetical early Shrew play upon which Shakespeare based The Shrew. If the reader will turn back to the section entitled 'Supposes', 'The Shrew', and 'A Shrew' he will see that where Creizenach and Alexander find that A Shrew is further removed from Supposes than The Shrew is, it is possible apart from one point to adopt the explanation that the sub-plots of the two extant Shrew plays are independently based on Supposes and that the author of that of A Shrew, having a very inexact knowledge of the Ariosto play, clumsily altered certain features of his source which Shakespeare retained and developed. But, as has been already pointed out, those responsible for A Shrew seem to have been so anxious to include an episode in which Katharina smashes a lute over the head of an unfortunate tutor that they very awkwardly gave the servant Valeria two disguises. This episode owes nothing to Supposes, but it is described (though not enacted) in The Shrew (II i 142 ff.). It seems to me quite possible that, apart from the 'taming' scenes and the Induction, A Shrew and The Shrew are independently based on a lost Shrew play in



which the sub-plot was founded upon Supposes,<sup>1</sup> and in which someone gave the shrew a music-lesson to his own eventual chagrin. It may then be supposed that the reconstructors responsible for A Shrew, having an exceedingly imperfect knowledge of this lost play, altered certain features of it which had been taken from the Ariosto play and which Shakespeare preserved when he revised the lost play into The Shrew. Such a hypothesis would explain the facts observed by Creizenach and Alexander in their comparison of Supposes and the two Shrew texts.

We might assume that a Cleander-Gremio existed in the lost play, giving point to the part played in the action by the servant disguised as his master (Dulippo in Supposes, Valeria in A Shrew, Tranio in The Shrew). This character has been omitted by the reconstructors responsible for A Shrew, but preserved by Shakespeare. But we would assume that Polidor-Hortensio was a suitor for the shrew's second sister in the lost play; the reconstructors of A Shrew have preserved this, but Shakespeare has altered it in his revision of the early play.

- 
1. Ten Brink held that the lost play (which he believed to have been Shakespearian) was not founded on Supposes. But A Shrew itself goes back ultimately to that play in certain respects -- the exchange of identity between master and servant, the securing of a stranger to pose as the hero's father and promise the lady's father a large marriage-settlement, the discovery of the deceptions by the real father. See Tolman, P.M.L.A. vol. V, p.215, and The Views About Hamlet, p.303.

A NOTE ON THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE  
MEMORIAL RECONSTRUCTION.

The Pembroke company, not heard of before 1592, is known to have been virtually bankrupt by the autumn of 1593.<sup>1</sup> Alexander (T.L.S. Sept. 16, 1926) suggests that under these circumstances the company sold to Lord Strange's Men their prompt-copies of II and III Henry VI and The Taming of the Shrew. A remnant of the company, however, may have decided to try its luck in the provinces once more, for which purpose memorial reconstructions of these plays were made. This last effort presumably meeting with no success, the Pembroke remnant was forced to sell the memorial reconstructions to publishers, whence the appearance of the Quartos entitled The 1st Part of the Contention (pub. 1594 by Millington), The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York (pub. 1595, also by Millington), and The Taming of A Shrew (pub. 1594, by Burby). Of these, the first was printed by Creed, the other two by Short.

Chambers,<sup>2</sup> however, holds that the Pembroke company came

1. Cf. Henslowe's letter to Alleyn, 28 Sept., 1593: "As for my lorde a Penbrockes wch you desier to knowe wheare they be they ar all at home and hausse ben this v or sixe weackes for they cane not saue ther carges wth trauell as I heare & weare fayne to pane ther parell for ther carge." See Greg, Henslowe Papers, p. 40.

2. Elizabethan Stage, vol. II, pp. 129 seq.

into existence in 1592 owing to "the special conditions of the plague-years 1592-3"; its origin "was due to a division for travelling purposes of the large London company formed by the amalgamation of Strange's and the Admiral's." We are, then, to visualise two travelling companies in 1592-3, both derived from the temporary Strange's-Admiral's amalgamation, at least one of which (Pembroke's) was in serious financial straits by the autumn of 1593. Dover Wilson suggests that at this time of stress the sharers in both of these travelling groups re-united, and, being forced to economise, got rid of most of the hirelings and boys. He suggests, then, that the group of actors responsible for the memorial reconstruction of A Shrew and other texts "was mostly composed of hired men and boys, formerly attached to the Pembroke and Strange companies."<sup>1</sup> This group may have attempted a provincial tour on its own. Discharged hirelings would, of course, have no access to the 'books' of plays in which they had acted; the sharers would retain control over these.<sup>2</sup> The group of

---

1. New Cambridge edition of The Shrew, p. 112.

2. A 'good' Q of Edward II (Marlowe) appeared in 1594 "As it was sundrie times publiquely acted in the honourable citie of London, by the right honourable the Earle of Pembroke his seruants": it was published by William Jones. For a plausible suggestion that this Q was first published in 1593 see Tucker Brooke, Modern Language Notes, 1909, pp. 71-3. Presumably the sharers included in the Pembroke group sold this text to Jones, who entered it in the Stationers' Register on July 6, 1593. Again, a 'good' Q of Titus Andronicus was published by White and Millington, printed by Danter, in 1594 (entered by Danter in

hirelings and boys would therefore be forced to make memorial reconstructions in order to provide themselves with acting copy.

This hypothesis fits the condition of the text of A Shrew extremely well. The reconstructing group would contain actors who had played only some of the parts in The Shrew, and these not the most important parts. I assume that this group did not include any actor who had played in the sub-plot; this would account for the almost complete absence of verbal parallels in the sub-plots of A Shrew and The Shrew. But it doubtless contained several actors who had taken minor parts in the main taming-plot: very probably the Haberdasher was one, for the scene in A Shrew in which he is involved contains practically nothing not directly derived from The Shrew.<sup>1</sup> The closeness of

S.R. 6 Feb. 1594). This Q has the names of the companies of Derby, Pembroke, and Sussex on the title-page, in that order. Presumably the sharers in the Pembroke company sold a transcript of this play to the Sussex company at the time of their financial crisis. See Chambers, op. cit. p.129. Dover Wilson suggests (op. cit. 108) that the original of the transcript was probably consulted during the printing of the F text, which, though printed from a reprint of the 1594 Q, contains a scene not found in the Qq. It would seem, then, that although a transcript was sold to Sussex' men, the original remained with the Strange sharers.

1. On the other hand, the scene in which Ferando woos Kate in A Shrew is not nearly so close to The Shrew; presumably the reconstructing group did not include the boy who had played the part of Kate. The part of Petruchio would of course belong to a 'sharer'.

the two versions of the taming-plot, and the divergence between the two sub-plots can thus be adequately explained. We may go even further and suggest as a possibility that the reconstructing group included an actor (or actors) who had played in the sub-plot of an earlier Shrew play now lost, and that he furnished some material from his recollection of that earlier sub-plot.<sup>1</sup> Finally, we may suppose that the group included two men of some literary power, one a comic writer, the other a verse-writer steeped in Marlowe. These two worked over the material brought together by the collective memory of the group, in order to render it reasonably coherent. And doubtless in places they used their invention to eke out scantily reported material: this was probably especially the case with the Marlowesque poetaster.

- 
1. A similar suggestion has been made by H. D. Gray in the case of Der Bestrafte Brudermord. See Philological Quarterly, vol. VII (1928) p. 258. Gray holds that the German text is based on Shakespeare's play as it appeared in 1600-1, but that the Prologue is that of Kyd's Hamlet. He suggests that one member of the troupe responsible for the memorial reconstruction had played the part of Night in the Ur-Hamlet; and he further suggests that this actor would be able to eke out the company's memory of the Shakespearian play with fragments which he recollected from the Kyd play.



SAMUEL ROWLEY'S HAND IN "A SHREW"?

In the second essay in his Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama (pp. 49-78)<sup>1</sup> H. Dugdale Sykes contends that two hands are discernable in A Shrew. He points to the very distinct stylistic differences between the prose portions (in the Induction and Interludes, and, in the play proper, the comic scenes in prose or prosaic blank verse) and the Marlowesque verse portions (which are mostly confined to the sub-plot). There are places where the work of these two hands seems to be closely intermingled; so Sykes suggests that the whole play was in the first instance written by the hand which is still seen in the prose portions, and that an unknown imitator of Marlowe revised it, altogether re-writing certain scenes and leaving others practically untouched.

Sykes finds several phraseological links between the prose portions of A Shrew and that curious text The Famous Victories of Henry V. Certain tricks of speech are common to both. The exclamation "souns" occurs frequently in both, and in neither is it restricted as the mannerism of one character alone. "I warrant you" occurs eight times in the prose parts of A Shrew, and five times in the Famous Victories. The phrase "as passeth" is found twice in each. The ejaculation "O brave!" appears four

---

1. Originally published as No. 4 of the papers of the Shakespeare Association (1920: out of print).

times in these portions of A Shrew, and five times in the Famous Victories. The verb "to course" (i.e. to beat) is found three times in the prose parts of A Shrew, and Sykes refers to one appearance in the Famous Victories. The expression "let (me, him, etc.) alone with" occurs in both. There are other parallels:

F.V. sig. Elv in the 1598 Q: the Constable of France says to the Archbishop of Bourges "Tush, we will make him (i.e. Henry V) as tame as a lamb, / I warrant you".

A Shrew, Hazlitt's ed. of Shakespeare's Library, Pt. II vol. ii, p. 514: Sander says to Polidor's Boy "Heele make hir tame wel inough ere long I warent thee".

F.V. sig. B4v: John Cobler claims that he is the Lord Chief Justice: "Mass, thou saist true," says Dericke, "thou art indeed".

A Shrew, p. 496: "By the masse I thinke I am a Lord indeed" (Sly).

F.V. sig. B3v: the Judge, to Prince Henry: "Why, I pray you, my Lord, who am I?"

also sig. B4v: John Cobler to Dericke: "But, I pray you, who am I?"

A Shrew, p. 533: the Duke of Cestus says to Aurelius "I pray you sir who am I?"

F.V. sig. C1r: the Prince to Oldcastle: "'Tis enough for me to look into a prison though I come not in myself, but here's such ado nowadays, here's prisoning, here's hanging, whipping and the devil and all: but I tell you, sirs, when I

am king we will have no such things."

A Shrew, p. 533: Sly, in an interlude: "I say wele haue no sending to prison."...."I tell thee Sim wele haue no sending / To prison thats flat: why Sim am not I Don Christo Vary?"

On these phraseological similarities and verbal parallels, then, Sykes bases his case for common authorship for the Famous Victories (whose style is homogeneous throughout) and the prose parts of A Shrew. He admits that some of the words and phrases which he uses as clues were not uncommon at the time; but he seems to think them unusually frequent in these two plays.

No. 10 in the list, given in an earlier section, of passages in A Shrew lifted from Marlowe occurs in the portion of the play which Sykes assigns to the author of the Famous Victories: it is borrowed from the 1616 text of Dr Faustus and not that of the 1604 Quarto (although the single word "pickadevants" is retained from the earlier text). Now Sykes finds that in the alterations and additions to Dr Faustus found in the 1616 edition some of those phrases are found which led him to posit common authorship for the Famous Victories and the prose portions of A Shrew. "Zounds" is found six times, "O brave" four times, "I warrant you" five times, "as 't passes" once: in addition he notes one occurrence of the phrase "you had best" which is found three times in A Shrew, and one appearance of the expression "had much ado to" (Famous Victories has "such ado" or "much ado" four times, A Shrew has "such ado" once and "more ado" once). Sykes also gives several parallel passages in the 1616 alterations and additions to Faustus and in the Famous Victories or the prose parts of

A Shrew:

1616 Faustus: Tucker Brooke, ed. Marlowe, p. 196, lines 807-9:

I'll tell thee what, an my Maister come here, I'll clap  
as faire a paire of hornes on's head as e're thou sawest  
in thy life.

Cf. F. V. Clv: the breath shall be no sooner out of his mouth,  
but I will clap the crown on my head.

A Shrew, Hazlitt, Shak. Lib. II ii p.509: And see you come  
no more into this place,/Lest that I clap your fiddle on  
your face. Also p.542: I haue had/The brauest dreame to  
night, that euer thou/Hardest in all thy life.

1616 Faustus: Tucker Brooke, p.211, lines 1050-1: I am content  
for this once to thrust my head out at a window:

Cf. A Shrew, Hazlitt, p.515: I am content for this once / To  
put it vp and be frends with thee,...

Henslowe records in his Diary the payment of £4 to William Birde and Samuel Rowley for additions to Dr Faustus (November 22, 1602). Rowley was the author of a play entitled When You See Me You Know Me, or The Famous Chronicle of King Henry the Eight, published in 1605 with Rowley's name on the title-page. Sidney Lee noted the similarity of this play to the Famous Victories (Life of Shakespeare, 1915, p.442). Sykes points out that in both it is the Clown rather than the King who is the chief figure. He finds in the Henry VIII play the same tricks of expression which he uses to suggest common authorship for the Famous Victories and the prose parts of A Shrew, and concludes that the two latter works are therefore to be ascribed to Rowley. He cites from When You See Me You Know Me four occurrences of "souns", two of "O brave!", two of "as passes", one of "you had best", one of "let me alone....", and no less than seventeen of

"I warrant thee (you, ye, it)"; he also notes the phrase "hard at hand", found once here, once in the 1616 additions to Faustus, and twice in A Shrew. In addition he quotes these parallel passages:

When You See Me, 1605, sig. C4r: Will Summers says to Patch, Wolsey's fool: "...an thou wert the devil himself he'll conjure thee I warrant thee, I would not have such a conjuring for twenty crowns.

1616 additions to Faustus: Tucker Brooke, p.196 line 806: "an my Maister come, he'll coniure you 'faith. Also p.208 lines 960-2: "...an he follow vs, I'll so coniure him, as he was neuer coniur'd in his life, I warrant him:."

Sykes finds marks of Rowley's hand in certain of the verse additions to Faustus as well as in the prose; and he points out that "the expanded passages of the revised text of Faustus dealing with the visit of Faustus to the Pope at Rome show the same fiercely anti-papal spirit as is manifested in many of the blank verse scenes of When You See Me, and they are couched in the same sort of language". He shows that in both there are lines with dactylic endings and that both exemplify the trick of putting polysyllabic adjectives ending in '-al' after the nouns they qualify. He would limit Birde's share in the Faustus additions to those made in the closing scenes of the play, where there is frequent use of antithesis -- a habit not found in When You See Me You Know Me.

By these processes Sykes identifies the author of the comic prose sections of The Taming of A Shrew as Samuel Rowley. And by the same methods he finds Rowley's hand in certain parts of the 1594 Quarto of Orlando Furioso involving the clowns Tom and



Ralph, and in the prose scenes of Wily Beguiled (pub. 1606). The same phraseological clues are utilised.

A criticism of Sykes' identification of the author of the prose of A Shrew appears in B.A.P. Van Dam's article on that text in English Studies (Amsterdam) vol. X (see pp. 101-2). He rightly complains that many of the phrases used to prove that identification are very common in the dramatic literature of the period. Take for example 'I warrant thee (you, ye, etc.)': Sykes gives 17 cases in When You See Me, and eight in the prose parts of A Shrew: Van Dam finds the expression twelve times in the Merry Wives of Windsor! So "it is not exceptionally frequent in A Shrew"; "if its excessive use was Rowley's hall-mark there is no reason to make its eightfold appearance in A Shrew a point for Rowley's authorship". Next take the "zounds" clue: this oath is pretty thoroughly expunged from the Shakespeare 1st Folio, but Van Dam points out that it appears altogether 25 times in 'good' Shakespearian Quartos -- e.g. six times in Othello, ten times in I Henry IV: it occurs no less than eighteen times in A Shrew. But in When You See Me it appears only four times. There is thus no direct evidence that Rowley was addicted to its excessive use. Van Dam goes on to say that the four occurrences of this oath in When You See Me are all limited to one character:<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Van Dam tentatively compares this with the fact that in When You See Me the oath "Mother a (of) God" occurs 17 times, always in the mouth of Henry VIII: further, the variations "God's holy mother" (six times), "God's mother" (three times),

yet Sykes (op. cit. p.50) expressly makes the point that in neither the Famous Victories nor the prose parts of A Shrew is the use of 'souns' confined to one character.

There are therefore some detailed objections to be made against Sykes's argument; yet it must be admitted that his accumulation of small coincidences of expression is most impressive. Obviously there is some sort of stylistic connection between the texts which Sykes examines.

Rowley is first heard of in June 1597, when he was with the Admiral's Men: but, as W. W. Greg points out, there is no reason against supposing that he had been connected with other companies before that year: in particular Greg thinks it highly probable that he was a member of the Queen's Company in the late 1580's. Now there is good evidence that the actor Tarlton took the part of the clown Dericke in the Famous Victories "and the opinion of Fleay and Ward that he also wrote the part is not to be lightly rejected. Even if it was not originally of his composition it seems likely that it would be largely coloured and moulded by his improvisation, and that as it has come down to us it may be substantially his" (Alcazar and Orlando, p. 360). Greg proceeds to a very plausible suggestion:

That much of what Mr Sykes ascribes to Rowley may have been

---

"God's dear Lady" (twice), "God's Mary Mother" (once), are likewise confined to the King. It is clearly intended as a personal characteristic. So the four occurrences of 'zounds' may be likewise intended. But Van Dam does not wish to press this argument.

actually written by him I have no wish to deny, but it seems to me that the criteria by which he judges may well be no more than tricks of the Tarlton tradition surviving in the Queen's company. Had Rowley been a young actor in that company in the days of its prosperity, had it perhaps fallen to him, after Tarlton's death in 1588, to carry on the part of the great clown, it would hardly be surprising if the clichés of that tradition clung to his work in later life. But that they always necessarily point to his authorship there seems no reason to believe: they would be common form among the Queen's men at least, and any comic part which took shape upon their stage might be expected to show the same characteristic touches.

Thus the position is that the prose parts of A Shrew display some characteristics of expression which may belong to the Queen's company tradition. And it is precisely these same parts of A Shrew which give evidence of being based on Shakespeare's The Shrew by memorial reconstruction. This seems to point directly to the conclusion that some person who had at one time been in the Queen's company, and who was a member of the group formed by the less important members of the two travelling companies derived from the Strange-Admiral's amalgamation, had a hand in the reconstruction of the taming-plot of A Shrew. Attempting to reconstruct the Shakespearian version (the taming-plot of The Shrew) this person introduced turns of expression which he had learned when attached to the Queen's company. That similar turns of expression, perhaps from the same source, occur in a play with Rowley's name on the title-page need mean no more than that he too had been affected by the Tarlton tradition.

But of course, as Dr Greg admits, Rowley may have had a hand in the 'taming' parts of A Shrew. If he were a member of the group of minor actors abstracted from the two 1592-3 touring

divisions of the Strange-Admiral's company, a not unlikely hypothesis, there would be no difficulty about agreeing with Dugdale Sykes that he contributed to A Shrew. Dover Wilson thinks that the company responsible for the reconstruction of A Shrew and other texts, "mostly composed of hired men and boys, formerly attached to the Pembroke and Strange companies" was "perhaps led by Samuel Rowley, whose hand Mr Sykes believes he has found in most of the said texts".<sup>1</sup>

This last suggestion is highly plausible, and it brings us to the last point. Even admitting that it is possible that we have Rowley's hand in the prose parts of A Shrew, we cannot, I think, give him quite the glory which Sykes claims for him. Swinburne, believing that A Shrew was the 'source' of The Shrew, and envisaging single authorship for it, was forced to characterise its author as at once "a clumsy and coarse-fingered plagiarist" from Marlowe, and "of all the pre-Shakespearians known to us incomparably the truest, the richest, the most powerful and original humorist" (Study of Shakespeare, p.125). The plagiarist's hand is seen mostly in the sub-plot, the 'original humorist's' in the parts involving Sly, Sander, Kate, and Ferando. Sykes, arguing very ably for dual authorship, can remove from the 'original humorist' the incubus of the 'more polished, but more insipid, verse scenes' written by some imitator of Marlowe. And Rowley stands out in his estimation as an

---

1. New Cambridge ed. The Shrew, pp. 112-3.

obscure author to whom posterity owes a great debt: "But for Sander we should have had no Grumio. And it is well to remember that it is to the hand that created Sander, almost as much as to Shakespeare's, that we owe The Taming of the Shrew" (Sykes, op. cit. p.77).<sup>1</sup> Even allowing Rowley a share in the composition of A Shrew this claim is unjustifiable: it is Rowley's part of that play which furnishes the clearest evidence of derivation from The Shrew or from a version very close to The Shrew. Even if Rowley was implicated the most we can claim for him is that in Sander he reproduced Grumio remarkably well. Assisting in a memorial reconstruction of The Shrew, he reproduced the original inexactly, often clumsily, but generally in a vigorous and lively fashion. Sykes's hypothesis is by no means inconsistent with the 'bad quarto' theory of A Shrew, and can indeed be made to fit it with remarkable ease.

---

1. Cf. also J. P. Collier, History of English Dramatic Poetry and Annals of the Stage, Vol. II, p.462: "Hurd gives Shakespeare great praise for 'the excellence of the moral design' of the Induction to his Taming of the Shrew, not being aware that the credit due on this account belongs to the author of the original comedy of 1594." It should be noted again that Sykes finds touches of Rowley in the Induction of A Shrew.



BIBLIOGRAPHY.THE TAMING OF A SHREW.

Alexander, Peter "The Taming of A Shrew", Times Literary Supplement, September 16, 1926.

Shakespeare's 'Henry VI' and 'Richard III', 1929, passim.

Shakespeare's Life and Art, 1939, pp. 69-71.

Boas, Frederick S. The Taming of A Shrew, edition with Introduction, 1908.

Bond, R. Warwick The Taming of the Shrew, Arden edition, Introduction (1st ed. 1904, 2nd ed. 1929).

Brink, Bernhard ten "Uber den Sommernachtstraum", Shakespeare Jahrbuch, Vol. XIII (1878), p. 94.

Bullen, A. C. Works of Marlowe, edition with Introduction, 1885, Vol I, pp. lxxiv-lxxvi.

Chambers, E. K. "The Earl of Pembroke's Men", The Elizabethan Stage, 1923, Vol. II, pp. 128-34.

William Shakespeare, 1930, Vol. I, pp. 322-8.

Courthope, W. J. History of English Poetry, Vol. IV, 1916, Appendix I, pp. 466-8.

Creizenach, W. Geschichte des neueren Dramas, Vol. IV, 1909, pp. 686-98.

Fleay, Frederick G. On the Authorship of "The Taming of the Shrew", Transactions of the New Shakspeare Society, 1874, pp. 85 seq.

Shakespeare Manual, 1876, pp. 175 seq.

Frey, A. R. The Bankside Shakespeare, Vol. II, 1888 (Shakespeare Society of New York).

Furnivall, F. J. Introduction, Praetorius' facsimile of the Quarto of The Taming of A Shrew, 1886.

Gollancz, Israel Introduction, The Taming of the Shrew, old Temple edition, 1894.

- Greg, W. W. Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements: The Battle of Alcazar" and "Orlando Furioso", Malone Society, 1922: Appendix, pp. 358-363.
- Hazlitt, W. C. Edition of Collier's Shakespeare's Library, Part II, Vol. II, pp. 485 seq. (1875). The Text of The Taming of A Shrew, with Amyot's introduction (pp. 487-90).
- Hickson, Samuel "Marlowe and the old 'Taming of A Shrew'": Notes and Queries, 1st Series, Vol. I (1849-50), two articles, pp. 194 and 226-7.
- "The Taming of the Shrew", Notes and Queries, 1st series, Vol. I, pp. 345-7.
- Raleigh, Walter Shakespeare (English Men of Letters series). 1907, pp. 110-2, 114.
- Ridley, M. R. The Taming of the Shrew, New Temple edition, 1934, Introduction.
- Robertson, J. M. The Shakespeare Canon, Vol. II (1923), "Marlowe and Comedy", pp. 134 seq.
- Simrock, Karl Die Quellen des Shakespeare in Novellen. Märchen und Sagen. Erster Teil, pp. 329-54 (2nd ed., 1870): 1st edition, 1831.
- Smart, J. S. Shakespeare, Truth and Tradition, 1928, pp. 201-5.
- Swinburne, A. C. A Study of Shakespeare, pp. 124-8 (2nd ed. 1880).
- Sykes, H. Dugdale Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama, 1924, Chapter II: "The Authorship of 'The Taming of A Shrew', 'The Famous Victories of Henry V', and the Additions to Marlowe's 'Faustus'".
- Tolman, A. H. "Shakespeare's Part in 'The Taming of the Shrew'" Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, Vol. V (1890) pp. 201-78.
- The Views About Hamlet, 1904, pp. 203 seq.; also pp. 292-311.
- Van Dam, B. A. P. "The Taming of A Shrew", English Studies, Vol. X (1928) pp. 97 seq.
- Wilson, J. Dover The Taming of the Shrew, The New Shakespeare (1928), "The Copy for The Taming of the Shrew, 1623" (pp. 104 seq.).